
Minutes of the Meeting: 9th December 2004 (held at UK Sport, 40 Bernard Street)

Present

Chair

Sue Campbell

Members

Alastair Dempster
Connie St Louis
Eric Saunders
Laura MacAllister
Louise Martin
Nick Bitel
Philip Carling

UK Sport Staff

Liz Nicholl	Acting Chief Executive
John Scott	International Director
Neil Shearer	Director, Corporate Services

Observers

Ian Taylor	SportScotland
Eammon McCartan	Sports Council Northern Ireland
Roger Draper	Sport England
Huw Jones	Sports Council Wales

1. Introduction

Sue Campbell welcomed members to the meeting and congratulated Ian Taylor on his appointment as Chief Executive of Sport Scotland. Members were reminded of the need to declare their interest in any transactions requiring a decision and to remove themselves from such decision making. This would be formally reported in the minutes and on a register completed at the meeting.

Apologies for Absence

Lord Patrick Carter sent apologies to the meeting

2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 14th October 2004

The amendments to the minutes, embedded into a second draft that had been circulated, were noted. Other amendments or comments noted were:-
Item 3.1d – Some members expressed a reservation regarding the Mega Events strategy but were advised this was being dealt with by DCMS. Copies of UK Sport's Major Events Strategy approved by the Board will be re-circulated for information.

Item 5.1 – The Minutes should indicate that the investment strategy approval was subject to impact being clear. This was being covered in Item 4.

Item 5.6 – It was noted that references to Board approval of Chairs Action

were there for protection of the Chair and this would be addressed within the Delegated Authority paper that will be submitted to the January Council.

3 Matters arising

3.1 Office Location

The Chair introduced the paper regarding office location which recommended: That UK Sport remain located at Bernard Street for the short/medium term and reaffirms its decision to offer a co-location the BPA and to provide hot desk/flexible accommodation for other World Class Performance partners including BOA/EIS

Members acknowledged that some savings could be made in the longer term by moving the office to an out of London location. Chair advised that discussions had taken place with DCMS regarding the Lyons review. It had been agreed that there would be an opportunity to relocate some staff out of London within, for example, the Institute network. As a whole, however, the organisation is served better with a London base as most of UK Sports significant business relationships are in or around London.

Members were advised that the BPA had accepted the invitation (agreed at the October Council meeting) to relocate to UK Sport as of March 2005. Chair also advised that discussions were currently underway regarding the BOA and EIS hot-desking some of their performance staff at UKS. This would increase occupancy by 18% at Bernard Street.

The recommendation outlined above was agreed by Members.

Members were concerned about the impact the uncertainty of office location was having on staff and recruitment and expressed a need for the outcome to be communicated to staff quickly. Liz Nicholl advised this would be conveyed at the all staff brief scheduled for 14th December.

Chair and Staffing Update

Liz Nicholl advised members that recruitment of the Chair was underway through DCMS and 10 short listed applicants were to be interviewed 16/17th December 2004. A decision is expected shortly after Christmas. The recruitment of the Chief Executive is to commence in January once the Chair has been announced. Members were also informed that the appointment of Director of Policy and Communications had been made and Tim Hollingsworth would join UK Sport in March 2005. The appointment of the Head of National Anti-Doping was being progressed. Three candidates were being taken through to second interviews taking place in January.

3.2 Scrutiny Panel

John Scott introduced the item referring to the recommendations of the PMP Study for the establishment of an independent Scrutiny Panel. UK Sport had commissioned a report from the Foresight Partnership to make recommendations on putting this into practice including proposed terms of reference, ways of working, role of Chair and panel members and person specifications for panel members.

Adrienne Fresko joined the meeting. She delivered a presentation on her report submitted to members. Members welcomed the report and made the following comments:

- The core purpose of the Scrutiny Panel is to ensure no conflict of interest exists between the work of UK Sport in Performance and Drug Free Sport. Its mandate should be tightly focused.
- It is important that the Panel be seen to be independent and provides recommendations to Council for any action
- Council is responsible for the policy and performance of DFS and its delivery of the drug free sport programme
- Chair and membership of the Panel must be credible with the sporting community.
- Issues of freedom of information and confidentiality will be managed and made as transparent as legislation permits.
- WADA and the Council of Europe were sources of good practice rather than 'interfaces' for the Panel.
- It would be appropriate for Council to review progress of the Panel after a year to a year and half of operation.

It was agreed that Ms Fresko would revise her report in the light of these and any other comments which Members agreed to pass to John Scott by email by the end of the first week of January. This will enable a final decision to be made at the January meeting.

3.3 Delegated Authority

This paper was withdrawn and deferred to the January Council meeting

4. Investment

4.1 Investment Strategy Update

- a)* Liz Nicholl took members through the circulated update on the Investment Strategy summarising the principles of the model approach to manage a finite budget , deliver outcome goals, ensure 'no compromise' world class support to the right athletes,
- b)* The model approach provided an open, transparent, logical process for arriving at the level of investment
- c)* Investment through NGB's/athletes should reflect existing performance levels. Investment risk is lower where there is evidence of success in the Olympic arena
- d)* Investment where there is most confidence that athletes and the sport can deliver improved performances leading to medals is more speculative.
- e)* In arriving at the recommendations, approximately 75% of resources will be allocated on a low risk basis with 25% allocated on future medal potential.
- f)* The approach must take UK Sport where it needs to be and therefore funding recommendations will be finalised following the UK Wide One Stop Plan review meetings and detailed impact discussions including Home Country Sports Councils.
- g)* At this stage the need for sport specific flexibility is considered as is assessment of targets, contribution to the 35 medals needed and risk.
- h)* Maximum athlete numbers for receipt of APAs will be set for each

sport. Sports can select fewer, and concentrate more resource on the smaller number. Sports can select more within limits to be agreed but with no additional APA. The PD will be given flexibility within an overall programme budget.

- i)* Discussions of impact on each sport and Home Country Sports Councils is being discussed on a sport by sport basis at officer level and at CEO level.
- j)* It was agreed that a meeting with Home Country CEO's would take place early in the New Year to address any emerging issues prior to recommendations being considered by Council in January.

It was noted that officers were withdrawing the suggestion included in the report that the programme name be changed.

Announcements on award decisions to be taken at the next Council meeting would be discussed with London 2012 to ensure that impact on the bid is positive. The small number of sports affected adversely by award decisions would have award changes phased over 2005/06.

A draft Paralympic investment strategy will be ready for discussion at the January meeting.

4.2 Investment Strategy Addendum

Nick Bitel left the room citing a Conflict of Interest

- a) Athletes who cannot compete at the Olympic/Paralympic Games
UK Sport documentation outlining the purpose of WCPP funding, does not state explicitly that WCPP funding should be directed only to athletes capable of participating in and winning Olympic/Paralympic medals.

There are WCPP athletes who compete at World Championships but do not go on to compete at the Olympic Games for a variety of reasons (injury, illness, retirement, non-qualification). There are other athletes however who have served a doping ban, returned to compete at a World Championships but cannot compete at the Olympic Games because of the BOA Bye-Law. They have been eligible to return to the World Class Performance Programme because their doping infraction was committed prior to the Statement of Anti-Doping. Council Members were invited to discuss whether such athletes should in future be supported on the World Class Performance Programme.

A decision was deferred pending legal advice.

- b) Extension to WCPP Employment Contracts

It was agreed that Officers should work on a sport by sport basis and, where necessary and appropriate, agree to a short term extension of employment contracts for a period of up to 3 months in need wish to retain within the programme.

4.3 Investment Decisions - Major Events

John Scott introduced the paper on the funding of the 'start and finish' towers at Eton Dorney rowing lake emphasising the significance of the venue to the two World Class events being supported by UK Sport and the

contractual requirement to provide facilities that meet IF standards.

It was confirmed that the contribution of £112,000 came from Exchequer not Lottery funds. Members were informed of the level of public use of the lake including schools from Slough and by the participation programme of the ARA – Project Oarsome.

Members endorsed the decision to contribute to the costs of the ‘start and finish’ towers.

5. Policy

5.1 National Anti-Doping Policy

John Scott introduced the paper and the final draft of the proposed UK National Anti-Doping Policy. This document had undergone considerable consultation with stakeholders as has been reported to members previously. Feedback has been extremely positive.

It is clear that the implementation of the WAD Code is going to take longer than had been anticipated and that harmonisation will remain a challenge whilst certain articles of the Code allow for differences in interpretation. As the NADO for the UK, UK Sport requires a consistent approach to all sports it deals with and this provides the major challenge with IFs handing down subtly different rules and regulations.

A number of outstanding issues remain:

- The lifetime ban from funding for athletes and support personnel. Additional legal advice is being sought but officers believe Council should maintain its position.
- The National Tribunal Service. A report has been received from SDRP which officers are now analysing but it is clear this is a complicated issue that will require further work if it is to be effective and supported by all sports.
- Work is needed to develop a procedure for sanctioning sports that do not abide by the policy and the standards that will be applied.
- The policy needs to address how funding sanctions will be applied to those receiving lower bans due to no fault or no significant fault or negligence mitigation.
- A number of non-Olympic sports are funded by the Council and through the WCEP. What will be the procedure for dealing with those that are not national policy compliant?
- Government funding of events has implications for the devolved administrations. HCSCs to raise this with their Executives. UK Sport to take up with DCMS.

In light of the discussion, members requested a further paper be presented to the January meeting discussing the implications of these high level issues in order that the policy can be agreed and communicated to all sports.

5.2 SIA Legislation

Nick Bitel left the meeting citing a Conflict of Interest

John Scott introduced the paper. Members were aware of the significant

threat this legislation posed to sport and its financial capacity. It was confirmed that the legislation only applied to England and Wales. Sports Council for Wales noted the threat to Welsh rugby and agreed to liaise with the Welsh Executive and Sports Minister.

Letters have been sent to senior officials dealing with the issue in the Home Office clearly outlining UK Sport's position. In addition, the Chair will be writing to the Home Secretary reinforcing the danger of this legislation being applied to sport – something it was never intended to do. Copies will be forwarded to Sport England and the Sports Council for Wales.

5.3 Sponsorship

Chair introduced the report on sponsorship which had been produced by Helen Day Consulting.

There was some concern from Members regarding the appropriateness of an NDPB trying to raise sponsorship. Members acknowledged that there were some programmes of work managed by UK Sport that could be attractive to a sponsor and these were identified in the report. Examples were the major conferences held throughout the year. Members felt that there was also potential for income generation linked to, for example, programmes of work being sold on to other countries.

It was noted that the responsibility would need to be managed professionally by a dedicated person. Members were advised that this had been identified within the staff restructuring plan and the responsibility would be managed within the Policy and Communications Directorate.

It was agreed that further work was needed to identify opportunities, costs, risks and revenue generating opportunities other than sponsorship.

6. Corporate Services

6.1 Financial Management Report

The revised budget 2004/05 was noted together with the financial report for October.

- The finance report incorporated the results of a review of the overall budget and a review of the profile of expenditure for the remainder of the year. Year to date outcomes for October were therefore in line with the revised budget.
- The revised budget included the element of savings required in 2004/05 to support the “zero deficit” plan for 2005/09.
- The maximum funds required from the Home Countries in 2004/05 had been reduced from £9m to £6m, this would be further reviewed in the New Year.
- The profile of grant commitments had been changed to reflect a bringing forward of the majority of 4 year commitments into 04/05. In the original plan financials the assumption was that this would occur in 05/06.
- The budgeting process for 2005/06 was underway and in line with the business plan. The impact of the budget on the plan will be reported as part of the 2005/06 Budget paper.

7. Meeting Dates

7.1 As the January Council date clashes with the **sportscotland** Board meeting it was agreed that it would be changed from 26th January. **Next meeting to be held on 25th January 2004 10.30am**

7.2 2005 Meeting Dates

All future meeting dates for 2005 agreed.

8.0 Any Other Business

Members advised of the wish to discuss Framework of Responsibilities of the Chair, Board, Panel, Executive and the DCMS at the January meeting.

Members noted the report on the pre-Games testing programme which had achieved considerable improvement on the Sydney Games especially in the Paralympic disciplines. Members congratulated DFS on their efforts.

As there was no further business the meeting closed at 1.00pm