



Minutes of the UK Sport Board Meeting held on 11th October 2005 at UK Sport

Present

Chair Sue Campbell

Members Connie St Louis
Laura McAllister
Nick Bitel
Julia Bracewell
Patrick Carter
Louise Martin
Eric Saunders
Philip Carling
Rod Carr
Chris Holmes

UK Sport Staff	John Steele	Chief Executive
	Liz Nicholl	Director, Performance
	Neil Shearer	Director, Corporate Services
	Tim Hollingsworth	Director, Policy & Communications
	John Scott	International Director
	Emyr Roberts (Item 6)	Performance Programme Consultant

Board Secretariat Aimée Wells UK Sport

1. Introduction and Apologies for Absence Action

Chair welcomed members to the meeting.

Chair introduced and welcomed two new Board Members, Rod Carr and Chris Holmes, and extended congratulations on their appointments.

Members were advised that confirmation was still being sought from the Secretary of State on the members that are to remain on the Board after their term ends in November.

2. Declaration of Interest

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.

3. Minutes of the Board Meeting held on 13th July 2005

Following discussions outlined below, the minutes of the meeting of the 13th July 2005 were approved and signed by the Chair as an accurate record

UKS

- Item 6: Matters Arising – An update was given on the BPA. An action plan has now been agreed to address the Management Audit concerns.
- Item 6.4: Response to Post-2009 Lottery Share consultation - The joint paper is in its final draft stage awaiting comments from SE & NI.
- Item 9.1: NGB Agreement (anti-doping) – Discussion arose on the responses from the HCSCs. It was noted there is ongoing dialogue between Scotland and UK Sport regarding specific wording issues, which both sets of lawyers are currently looking into.
- Item 10.1: Year End Accounts - Members queried whether the end-year flexibility had been confirmed to carry over under-spend and were advised that DCMS had agreed this. The consultation with athletes regarding changes to the APA awards structure is currently being progressed, with the paper – containing three options for decision - being dispatched that week. **It was agreed that the paper would be attached to Board Minutes for information**

4. Executive Team Report

The Executive Team Report was tabled and John Steele took members through the past two month's activity.

- He highlighted UK Sport's post-bid activity and gave particular thanks to Liz Nicholl and Peter Keen for all their hard work on the 2012 performance planning documentation being submitted to the Treasury.
- Transfer of Responsibilities – A Project Executive and Group have been put together within UK Sport to ensure effective transfer. There were queries from **Sportscotland** regarding the transfer of responsibility for potential level funding and links with home country funding. It was noted that the current arrangements would continue. If additional 2012 funding is received at the levels requested it would then be possible for UK Sport to support the whole pathway for UK sports. **There would be full discussion with home country sports councils on any aspect of the transfer that might impact on them before any changes were initiated.**
- Regarding the amount to be transferred for the pathway funding element of Whole Sport Plans, SE would be working with the NGBs to identify the allocated budget.
- It was noted that the transfer of responsibilities would require the Board to consider further how it operates when deliberating on England-specific matters, such as investment through the EIS. A Service Level Agreement between UK Sport and Sport England will be developed as part of the transfer plan. This will be put before the Board for approval in due course.

UKS

UKS

5 Matters Arising

Laura McAllister joined the meeting at 1015

Tim Hollingsworth updated Members on the DCMS Lottery post-2009 process to date. The completed document is currently with DCMS and will be posted on their website, with leaflets available. The next stage will be a questionnaire which will form the basis of a 6 month consultation period (Nov-May'06). Once responses have been received a decision on the future percentage share of the causes receiving lottery funding will be made (Summer 06).

UKS

TH will update members at each Board meeting of progress whilst working in conjunction with the Home Countries to ensure a whole sport process.

6 Performance

Emyr Roberts joined meeting

6.1 2012 Performance Planning

Members were advised that this item would be discussed in more detail in the afternoon session of the Board Away Day

6.2 Winter Sport Investment Strategy 2006-2010

Emyr Roberts presented a paper outlining further work carried out since the July Board meeting on the proposed investment model for winter sport for the period 2006 – 2010. As agreed at the July Board, this would follow a similar approach to the summer Olympic investment for Beijing. The key principles highlighted were: the need to agree high level goal for 2010; to agree to fund a maximum number of athletes; that APA places be offered to sports based on combination of Turin results and potential to deliver in Vancouver in 2010 (with greater emphasis on the latter); that programme funding allocated to sports be based on a fixed sum per year per athlete; and that world class operations funding to the NGB should be proportional to the WCPP investment.

After discussion it was agreed that;

- An initial investment of £5.5million should be allocated to support winter sport October 2006 – September 2010.
- A maximum of 15 APA places would be offered to winter sports (with consideration given to allocating additional APA places to Curling).
- WCPP awards to winter sports would in broad terms follow the summer Olympic model of allocating £45k per athlete per year, however flexibility would be required to adjust this amount across the winter sports, in recognition of the different requirements and characteristics of each programme and the less developed performance system.
- Any reduction in levels of world class operations funding to the NGB's should be managed in a phased manner over the four year cycle.

6.3 Non-Olympic/Non-Paralympic Performance Investments

Liz Nicholl introduced this item to update on progress to date.

An update paper was received on the consultation and communication

with the seven sports impacted by the proposed new funding framework. Responses were due by December 2nd and any feedback that materially altered the proposed approach would be brought back to the January Board meeting for consideration. The communication had included the point that home country sports councils had requested i.e. that sports should not approach home countries for replacement funding.

The following was agreed:

The phasing out awards proposed for each sport have been considered on a case by case basis, influenced a number of factors including an analysis of the governing body's financial position. UK Sport has repeatedly given its assurances that it will manage the phasing out as expediently but as carefully as possible and as a consequence the phasing out programme cannot be managed within the £300,000 per annum budget allocated to the non Olympic sports. Over the next three years, an additional £183,837 shall be needed but this can be accommodated within UK Sport's overall exchequer budget for performance.

6.4 Athlete Eligibility

The Board approved the expanded policy statement as follows:

Normally UK Sport would expect athletes nominated for the WCPP to be eligible to compete at the Olympics/Paralympics and therefore contribute directly to our priority high level Olympic/Paralympic medal targets.

However, consideration will also be given, on an exceptional basis, to athletes who could indirectly contribute to those targets (and thereby justify investment) by one of the following routes;

- Gain an individual qualification place or contribute to team qualification, where there is another athlete with strong medal potential available to take up the qualification place (who could therefore contribute directly to high level medal targets).
- Potential World Championship medallists who meet the category B funding requirement i.e. who have finished within top 8 at most recent World Championship, (with additional benchmarked evidence that the gap to the podium is bridgeable) as they could bring GB success and stimulate the competitive environment for other athletes eligible to compete at the Olympics/Paralympics.

Additionally the Board discussed athletes hoping to transfer from another country to compete for Team GB. It was agreed that athletes that meet the appropriate performance standards would be eligible for funding when their eligibility to compete for GB is confirmed. If all eligibility criteria has been met and the athlete is only awaiting, for example, the passing of time (e.g. from previously competing for another country) then funding could be considered on a case by case basis.

7 Corporate

7.1 Finance Report

- UK Sport's End Year Flexibility had been agreed by DCMS
- UK Sport will aim to use the EYF funds throughout the business plan period to fund higher APA awards. The Treasury is encouraging phased use of EYF funds and UK Sport officials have discussed with

- Treasury having this in place for whole 4 year business plan.
- Lottery income is currently higher than budget projection. UKS projections are now 8% higher than budget year to date
- There is under-spend on operational and corporate costs vs. budget. This will be subject to the six month budget review.
- A new budget will be in place from 2006 to account for the upcoming transfer of performance responsibilities

Due to the difficulty of encapsulating the one year nature of operating costs and income and the longer term (4yr) phasing of grant commitments in one simple single report, possible alternative presentations will be explored for future reports to Board Members.

UKS

8 Policy & Communications

8.1 Position Paper on the Impact of 2012 on UK Sport

Tim Hollingsworth introduced the paper, which was the product of consultation with staff and sought to identify the opportunities and challenges to UK Sport presented by the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. The paper was generally supported, with approval for the fact that it covered major events, international and drug-free sport as well as performance. Discussion focused on the partnership role of the BOA (para 5), on the need for major events in the build up to 2012 to engage the country as a whole and add to the legacy value of the Games (para 13), on Glasgow's bid for the 2014 Commonwealth Games to be recognized as one of the key events being sought post-2012 (para 14) and on the need for geographic diversity to be recognized alongside ethnic in the make up of Team GB and supporting staff and administration (para 20). With regard to the determination of the options for Team GB competitiveness (para 10) it was agreed that more detailed discussion would be held over to the presentation in the afternoon.

With regard to funding for Major Events (paras 13/14) John Scott informed the Board that the exercise of updating the Major Events strategies for the majority of Olympic sports had been completed and that over the period 2006-12 the Major Events budget would need to increase substantially to ensure delivery of the events and opportunities for young people. The Chair added that this information had been communicated already to the DCMS and to LOCOG. **It was agreed that a paper outlining this strategy would be presented at the next meeting.**

UKS

8.2 Board Events Timetable

Accepted by the Board, with the addition of the World Track Cup Classic Cycling Event in Manchester on 9-11 December, which UK Sport is part-funding.

9.0 Drug Free Sport

9.1 Independent Appeal Process – Panel of Assessors

Liz Nicholl left the meeting

John Scott introduced the item taking Members through a history of the appeal process to date.

Members discussed the implications of the options and queried the position of the SDRP. It was confirmed that a paper would be brought to a

Board meeting on the SDRP in due course, following additional consultation. In light of this, members agreed to postpone any decision on the preferred option and to revisit the issue following this consultation.

John Scott informed members that Michael Beloff QC is providing an opinion on a National Hearing and Appeals body.

10 For Information

10.1 NGB Agreement Update

Members considered the information paper and were advised they would be updated regularly regarding progress.

Members reiterated their full support for the policy position of UK Sport and the content of the National Governing Body Agreement.

10.2 IDEALS

Members reviewed the IDEALS programme and congratulated staff on an exciting and dynamic project which complements the Dreams and Teams initiative.

Members endorsed the international work of UK Sport and stressed its significance in supporting the ambitions of London 2012. Also opportunities existed to UK Sport to support the bid of Glasgow for the 2014 Commonwealth Games linking their proposed conference in 2006 with our ongoing development work.

It was noted that DCMS is finalising its international strategy and that UK Sport's work should be central to this. Members noted the work that had gone on in creating stronger working relationships with the FCO and British Council and endorsed further exploitation of this relationship.

11. AOB

- It was agreed that the updated UK Sport Risk Register would be presented at the next meeting
- The Board also agreed in principle the meeting dates for 2006, as outlined below:

1030-1300hrs, UK Sport

17th January
8th March
24th May
25th July
20th September
21st November