



Minutes of the UK Sport Board Meeting held on 17th January 2006 at UK Sport

Present

Chair Sue Campbell

Attendees:

Members

Nick Bitel
Julia Bracewell
Louise Martin
Eric Saunders
Philip Carling
Rod Carr
Chris Holmes
Lord Patrick Carter

External

Nicola Roche, DCMS

UK Sport Staff

Liz Nicholl
Neil Shearer
Tim Hollingsworth
John Scott

Jane Swan
Alex Newton

Director, Performance
Director, Corporate Services
Director, Policy & Communications
Director Drug Free Sport,
International Director
Strategic Advisor (Item 9)
Performance Manager (Item 9)

Board Secretariat Aimée Wells

UK Sport

1. Introduction and Apologies for Absence

Action

Chair welcomed members and Nicola Roche of DCMS to the meeting.

No apologies were received for the meeting

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.

Nick Bitel advised of a conflict of interest with Item 10.2 of the agenda and Chair reminded him to remove himself from the decision making process.

3. Minutes of the Board Meeting held on 7th December 2005

Item 7.2 - **it was requested that if UK Sport met with Events Companies within the Home Countries that the Sports Council be advised of this to ensure their staff expertise is utilised.**

UKS

Item 9.1 – amendments were agreed to reflect the discussion of member support for the policy on Athlete Whereabouts. Amended minutes have been made available on the website.

UKS

4. Matters Arising

Tim Hollingsworth updated members on the Post 2009 Lottery Consultation. He stated that DCMS had indicated the consultation is going well with up to 1,200 responses received so far and although there is a skew in the responses to the South East region, all regions are being encouraged. UK Sport is being as proactive as possible in ensuring the public are aware of the consultation and colleagues in the Home Countries are communicating regionally. In addition to its own activity, UK Sport has made contact with the CCPR, BOA, BUSA and BAC to try and encourage them to use briefings and newsletters to ensure there is an understanding of the consultation. This will continue until the deadline in February.

Item 8.1 - Members requested an update on this item and Chair advised that discussions on additional funding for 2012 are ongoing and progressing well, with the argument put forward by UK Sport being viewed credibly within Government. Nicky Roche confirmed that the Treasury are sympathetic to the funding model submitted by UK Sport.

Members were also notified by the Chair of a successful series of meetings with representatives from the Summer Olympic sports that had taken place week commencing 3rd January. She stated that there had been full discussion on UK Sport's investment strategy and model and that the sports concerned had given a clear and strong message of support for the approach taken.

Item 7.2 – John Scott thanked the Board for their support in increasing the World Class Events budget and noted approval to the change. He assured Members that the budget would be spent effectively.

5. Executive Team Report

Members requested that the report be received electronically at the same time as it was sent to Chris Holmes and that Chief Officers are included in the distribution.

UKS

Chair confirmed to Members that Debbie Lye is now back full time at UK Sport.

6. Board Events Calendar

Members noted paper UKS 01 2006. Board Members were reminded that they can register an interest in attending any upcoming events to John Scott.

7. Panel and Committee Membership

Chair updated the Board on the proposed invitations to members to join UK Sport's various panels. The following accepted and confirmed: MESH – Nick Bitel to remain as Chair with Philip Carling & Louise Martin as members; Audit Committee – Louise Martin to Chair with Chris Holmes and former member, Connie St Louis, as members. Julia Bracewell will consider serving on the Audit panel and will inform Chair of her decision; Remuneration – Philip Carling to remain as Chair with Rod Carr joining as a member. Chair also thanked Nick Bitel formally for temporarily covering as Chair of the Audit Committee.

Members also requested that a CPD be booked regarding roles and responsibilities whilst serving on the Audit Committee.

UKS

John Scott tabled a paper on the Major Events Steering Group (MESH) Membership and reminded members that the terms of reference state that it is the responsibility of the Board to agree membership of the panel. As Pat Day is staying on the panel for another term the paper detailed the proposed new members.

Board approved the recommendation of Wendy Walker, Scott McCarthy, Jayne Pearce and Janice McAleese serving as members on the MESH.

8. Worldwide Impact

8.1 MESH Minutes

Members discussed and agreed the following recommendation

To provide a grant contribution of up to £262,000 towards the staging of the European Hockey 2007. Further conditions are to be added as follows:

- ***£50,000 of the award is to be ring fenced as a contingency (only to be drawn down with UK Sport approval) against TV production costs to ensure that the event has a domestic television airing.***
- ***An additional £124,000 of the award is to be ring fenced and held as a contingency, which can only be drawn down in whole or in part with prior written approval of UK Sport***
- ***UK Sport must approve plans for lighting arrangements especially for evening matches.***
- ***The funding contribution from Manchester City Council must be confirmed in writing.***

There was discussion amongst the members regarding the large amount of grant recommended for the World Triathlon Championships. John Scott advised that there were several organisational and logistical challenges affecting the project not least its size with over 2000 athletes, and noted that Manchester City Council was unable to fund the event due to course changes taking the route outside city boundaries. There is also no opportunity to generate TV or ticket income for this event. Members were assured that an independent feasibility study had taken place and that UK Sport had driven down £300,000 in costs on the original BTA budget.

Members therefore agreed: -

To provide a grant contribution of up to £815,000 (to include a ring fenced contingency of £100,000) towards the staging of the World Triathlon Championships 2010. Further conditions are to be added as follows:

- *Development officer post(s) must be new position(s) created specifically for the purpose of developing triathlon in Manchester and the North West.*
- *Any contingency required to cover additional prize money should not come from the UK Sport grant but from Salford City Council.*
- *Any surplus from the age group event, currently projected to be £19,000 must be channeled back into this event.*
- *An independent Chair for the organising committee should be recruited with strong business experience.*

Members requested copies of historical information on the location of WCEP funded events and a table of financial commitments to projected events up to 2012.

UKS

9. Performance

9.1 Non-Olympic Review Feedback

Jane Swan (Strategic Advisor) and Alex Newton (Performance Manager) joined the meeting

Chair advised that this paper has been brought back to the Board following formal consultation with the 7 non-Olympic sports which culminated in a meeting with the sports and the CCPR. The sports were given the opportunity to express their concerns about the proposed reductions in funding and to make their case for continued funding. Officers have since reviewed the decision reached at the May 2005 Board Meeting and recommend reconsideration of option 2 which only required sports to be currently funded by UK Sport and have a track record of medal success and future potential as set out below.

There followed a healthy debate amongst members on:

- whether these sports contribute significantly to UK Sport's aim to support World Class success;
- whether with reduced funding there is a level below which current performances could not be sustained;
- the historical nature of the funding relationship;
- the dependencies;
- the safety critical role of some the organisations.

Following the discussion, the members agreed to continue to support Option 1, as agreed at the Council Meeting of 17 May 2005. Non-Olympic funding would be directed in support of:

- **Non-Olympic sports currently funded by UK Sport (i.e. no new sports)**
- **Non-Olympic sports currently funded by at least two Home Country Sports Councils**
- **Non-Olympic sports with a track record of medal success at**

recent World Championships and with athletes with strong potential to become British World Champions in future (within the four year funding period)

- **Non-Olympic sports with established athlete pathways leading to a performance opportunity at a GB/UK level**

On that basis, the Board agreed that funding would continue for waterskiing and orienteering (with close scrutiny of performance and results for the latter) and phased out for the remaining five sports.

The Board only agreed to revisit this decision if further funding became available within the exchequer budget.

UKS

9.2 Summer Olympic Annual Performance Reviews 2005

Alex Newton took members through paper UKS 04 2006 and advised that the Paralympic performance reviews will be presented to the March Board meeting alongside the review of the One Stop Plan meetings held in December.

Discussion took place regarding performances against targets. Eight out of the 24 sports/disciplines had achieved 100% of targets. Trampolining, Shooting and Weightlifting were identified as not having met targets and a cause for concern. Members were informed that sport specific Action Plans are being developed for each funded sport. Members were also concerned about Athletics as they had won 3 medals, against a 4 medal target at the World Championship and have continuing governance issues. Liz Nicholl assured Members that governance issues that had a potential impact on performance were being addressed and an officer (who is also a Chartered Accountant) had been seconded from the Performance Directorate to support the PD in establishing financial systems to secure the performance budget management. UKA will continue to be monitored closely.

UKS

Members advised they would like to see the action plans for the sports with a three rating, plus Athletics and Swimming (Members recommended that these sports ratings are also changed to a three) to see how they are being developed. A concern was also expressed that UK Athletics was not targeting Commonwealth Games success and UK Sport advised they would speak with Dave Collins to clarify the situation.

Alex Newton left the meeting

9.3 Future Investment in SDRP

Jane Swan introduced paper UKS 05 2006 reminding Members that following the one year funding award of £150,000 in March 2005, further funding of SDRP would need to be agreed.

Discussion arising from the paper surrounded the service that SDRP provides. Members felt that they should only concentrate on being 'A provider of expert, independent, sports specific Dispute Resolution Services' as stated in point 5 as they currently offered a valuable and needed service.

Members agreed the following recommendations:-

- ***To provide the SDRP with an annual award of £150,000 for 2006-2007, 2007-2008 (confirmed) and 2008-2009 (planning figure only).***

- *That UK Sport will lead and manage a research project with SDRP's full involvement with a full report back to the UK Sport Board by December 2006.*
- *For UK Sport to require SDRP to refine its Business Plan, identifying clear priorities with measurable KPIs and outcomes against UK Sport's investment.*

In undertaking the research, UK Sport should undertake a full review of the body, to include the work their potential role as part of a UK National Anti-Doping Policy Independent Appeals Process and/or a National Tribunal Service.

UKS

Jane Swan left the meeting

10 Drug Free Sport

10.1 Scrutiny Panel – Initial Findings

John Scott introduced paper UKS 06 2006 highlighting in particular point 14 of the amended Terms of Reference.

Members agreed the revised Terms of Reference of the Scrutiny Panel.

10.2 NGB Agreement

Nick Bitel left the meeting due to a conflict of interest.

John Scott updated members of progress with the NGB Agreement. An extended deadline of 31st Jan had been given but dealing with the NGBs revealed a lack of decision making processes and often confusion on jurisdiction and affiliation that slowed the process significantly. Whilst deadlines were necessary and great efforts had been made to help sports meet these, he noted that ultimately we needed to obtain the buy in of sports and that penalties could be self defeating.

Efforts were being focussed on sports on the anti-doping programme so that missions can be undertaken in accordance with the new rules. To date, of the 80 agreements sent out to sports on the programme 40 had been returned. Of the 152 sent out to sports currently outside the testing programme 50 had been returned.

If sports fail to provide meaningful explanations for not signing by agreed dates UK Sport will have to consider removing them from the testing programme as non compliant sports.

A great deal of time has been spent working with Sport England on the Whole Sport Plan Funding Agreement that ties funding to Code compliance. A final version was submitted by Sport England to the four sports refusing to sign before Christmas which included a negotiated extension to June 2006 for these sports to sign the NGB Agreement. Of these four sports, three of their international federations are now Code compliant meaning there is no logical reason why they should not sign the NGB Agreement.

Sport England has set a deadline for return of the Whole Sport Plan funding Agreement and without this no funding will flow to these sports.

Lord Carter was thanked for his support and firmness in dealing with this issue which has caused no difficulties with the majority of sports.

It was noted that the Minister for Sport fully supported the position of the

Sports Councils and was using his best endeavours to get the sports to sign up and become Code compliant.

11. Policy

11.1 UK Sport Appeals Process Criteria

Tim Hollingsworth introduced a paper for discussion, prior to the issue being put forward for stakeholder consultation and then decision at the March Board. The paper outlined both the requirement for UK Sport to have a formal Appeals Process for re-instatement of funding following a serious doping offence and the criteria by which such a process should be considered. It also revisited some of the philosophical arguments behind UK Sport's current position on funding bans and asked the Board to endorse the position. It was strongly argued by some members that UK Sport's criteria should be informed by the individual circumstances of an appeal and not simply rely on evidence already presented elsewhere. However the majority view was that UKS should not become a 'star chamber' and make judgements on or second guess original appeals processes. It was very clearly stated that UK Sport must support a properly constituted and effectively delivered tribunal system. The firm view of the Board was that 'life should mean life' with regard to a funding ban for serious doping offences. There was support for the proposed consultation with NGBs and athletes (via the BAC) with the proposal being that the Criteria be attached to a subsequent paper for decision at the March Board outlining the proposed Independent Appeals Process for anti-doping.

11.2 UK Sport / HCSC Consultation Protocol

The proposed Protocol document was tabled for ratification by the Board. Two areas of concern were raised.

- fourth bullet in the Chief Operating Co-ordinating Group (COCG) Section on Page 2 ("identifying ways in which sport can contribute to the achievement of Government policy (particularly health, education and social inclusion"). Members wished to ensure that this was all about discussion and coordination of views and not making the COCG a formal route for consultation or Government action in response to these issues. The Home Country Chairs indicated they would check with their Chief Executives on this.
- Page 5. the final line – on protocol for announcements. There was concern that it gave the Home Countries opportunity for agreement of announcements and therefore a 'veto' (and vice versa). It was felt there was a need for this to be clarified.

Nicky Roche agreed that DCMS would take these action points forward, with a final version presented to the March Board.

12. Corporate

12.1 Risk Register

Neil Shearer introduced paper UKS 09 2006. Any further comments on the risk register or risks we may have omitted would be welcome. The discussion focused upon the high net exposure risks. It was agreed that at the March Board there would be a further discussion focusing on the "Third Party Reliance Risk" and the adequacy of the controls to mitigate this risk.

UKS

12.2 Financial Management Report

Members noted the latest year to date results of paper UKS 10 2006.

12.3 Audit Committee – Minutes and Revised Terms of Reference

The minutes were noted and the revised Terms of Reference Terms of Reference approved subject to the inclusion of a definition of 'member'

12.4 Transfer of Responsibility – Governance Matters

Governance Matters - The Board approved Point 9 allowing the Chair and the Accounting officer to sign the final EIS Memorandum and Articles of Association

TASS and its UK wide role was discussed. The strategy for TASS going forward will be the subject of a future board paper at the appropriate time.

13. AOB

There were no items for discussion

14. Date of Next Meeting

Due to travel plans for the Commonwealth Games, it was agreed to move the next meeting date to 7th March, 1030-1330 at UK Sport.

As there was no further business, the meeting closed at 1330