



Minutes of the UK Sport Board Meeting held on 7th March 2006 at UK Sport

Present

Chair Sue Campbell

Attendees:

Members

Nick Bitel
Julia Bracewell
Philip Carling
Rod Carr
Chris Holmes
Lord Patrick Carter

(from Item 10.2)

UK Sport Staff

Liz Nicholl
Neil Shearer
Tim Hollingsworth
John Scott

Director, Performance
Director, Corporate Services
Director, Policy & Communications
Director Drug Free Sport,
International Director

Alex Newton
Emyr Robert

Performance Manager (Items 9-11)
Performance Programme Consultant
(Item 11.3)

Mitch Hammond

Performance Programme Consultant
(Items 11.3-11.5)

Will Calvert
Peter Smith

Head of Finance (Item 10)
Policy Advisor (Item 13)

Board Secretary

Aimée Wells

UK Sport

1. Introduction and Apologies for Absence

Action

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting.

Apologies were received for the meeting from Louise Martin and Eric Saunders. Lord Patrick Carter sent a message advising he was held up at a meeting with the Minister and would be late.

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.

No conflicts of interest were declared.

3. Minutes of the Board Meeting held on 17th January 2006

Item 9.3 – An internal comment had been placed in the second bullet point of this item and was to be removed for accuracy reasons.

4. Matters Arising

Liz Nicholl advised that the action plans for athletics and swimming as mentioned in Item 9.2 of the minutes would be an agenda item at the next full Board meeting in May.

5. Executive Team Report

The Chair updated the members on John Steele's progress and advised he would be aiming to come back to work part time from April.

John Scott noted that there was a typographical error in the Drug Free Sport section (page 5) under the item on Testing. The 3 'positive' findings should read 'adverse' findings as they were still under investigation and further information was being collected.

6. Board Events Calendar

Members noted paper UKS 13 2006.

It was requested that the forthcoming Judo World Cup in Birmingham be highlighted and **members were advised that invitations would be sent out shortly.**

UKS

7. Transfer of Responsibilities

The Chair updated members on progress to date and advised that the internal project team had been working since October managing the transfer and that the EIS staff team had settled well into their new offices within UK Sport.

The TASS transfer and realignment required sensitive management. **A meeting with the TASS Advisory Group was scheduled for 8th March.** Chair advised that **Liz Nicholl was leading this work and will update the Board on the proposed changes, implications and timescales at the May meeting.**

UKS

Performance Pathway - liaison is ongoing with the governing bodies to ensure a smooth transition. Chair advised that the funding transfer from Sport England was complicated and discussions were still continuing between the two organisations and DCMS. This has to be resolved by the 8th March however to lay secondary legislation for the change in lottery funding. As a consequence, the Chair had taken the decision to hold back the presentation of the revised UK Sport 2006-2009 business plan for Board approval until such times as the funding figures had been confirmed. A decision is expected by 9th March.

8. Business Plan 2006-09

It was agreed to **schedule an extra Board meeting for end March/beginning April to approve the 2006-9 revised Business Plan. The Chair agreed to circulate the plan and the budgets as soon as the figures were confirmed.**

UKS

9. English Institute of Sport (EIS) Award

Alex Newton & Will Calvert joined the meeting.

Alex Newton informed members that the purpose of paper UKS 15 2006 is to show the background of the funding decisions Sport England made in support of the EIS for the period April 2002-March 2005 and 2005-2009, and to seek Board approval for the grant for the period 2006-09 as this responsibility transfers from Sport England to UK Sport from April 2006. The EIS Business plan 2005-2009 had been put before the Sport England Board and approved. Its re-submission as a grant application was a requirement linked to UK Sport's Section 27 request to DCMS. This application sought authorisation for UK Sport to make a lottery award to EISCo, an organisation in which UK Sport would be the sole shareholder.

It was noted that EIS services needed further realignment with the World class programmes while acknowledging that some sports will have a greater dependency than others on the institute network. It was felt important that the services become more 'athlete/demand' led and it was noted that some less experienced sports would need strategic direction on how to best use what is available. It was noted that UK Sport would be working with EIS to manage discussions on a sport by sport basis.

It was also agreed that UK Sport would re-visit EIS' KPIs to support the move to a more integrated framework.

UKS

After discussions, the following award was agreed:

- ***an annual award of £10.5m for 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009***
- ***the business plan for 2005 - 2009 as submitted***
- ***The conditions of grant already agreed with Sport England, to be included as part of any funding agreement.***
- ***UKS will initially use existing EISCo KPIs as per the current grant funding agreement, but a further condition of grant is for UK Sport to review these in the period post April 2006 and where appropriate these will be amended and enhanced.***

10 Corporate Services

10.1 2005/2006 End of Year Finance Report

The current year to date financial performance was noted. The full year forecast showed lower costs, driven by a review of performance programme costs, systems development cost avoidance and as a consequence of staff vacancies. As a result, Budgeted End Year Flexibility draw-down will be deferred, as planned, to meet athlete personal award needs from 2006, but 2005-6 GIA draw-down will be on Budget.

Overall income and expenditure for the four year cycle to 2009 is balanced. The lottery balance will be maintained below £10M at year end, representing less than six months throughput, whereas virtually all other distributors hold well in excess of a year's requirement.

The review of the Business Plan and 2006-7 Budget submission will be deferred, pending agreement of resource re-allocation as a result of the Transfer of Responsibilities.

Will Calvert left the meeting.

10.2 Risk Management

Patrick Carter joined the meeting

Alex Newton took members through paper UKS 17 2006. The paper detailed the highest risk that UK Sport currently has on its risk register which relates to '3rd party risk' and also the findings of the internal audit conducted, which highlighted some issues as indicated in the paper. The key changes and associated controls to manage the risks were put to the Board for information and were approved.

Members asked for clarity on point 9 which referred to members of the performance team being involved in NGB staff recruitment and were advised this related to CEO and senior World Class Performance programme appointments.

It was agreed that scrutiny needs to be applied to all 3rd parties receiving significant funds and whereas the controls were presented as applying to NGBs many were equally applicable to other funded organisations such as SDRP. The controls would now be reviewed by other Directorates to ensure that other significant 3rd parties were covered.

UKS

11. Performance

11.1 2012 Funding

The Chair advised Members that unfortunately UK Sport's document to bid for 2012 funding had accidentally been put in the public domain, for which an apology had been received from DCMS.

The Public Accounts Committee had then read this document and felt that some of the goals and targets referred to had contradicted some of the answers given at the PAC Hearing. Liz Nicholl and Dame Sue Street had therefore been recalled to re-submit further evidence on the 6th March.

At the second hearing the committee had concluded that it was a case of inconsistent use of terminology relating to aspirational goals and targets in key documents that had led to misunderstandings and there had been no intention to mislead. The matter was now closed.

In the meantime there had been unfortunate adverse media comment. Liz Nicholl informed the Board that she had received a phone call that morning from a member of the Public Accounts Committee reassuring her that her integrity was in no way being called into question. The Board expressed its desire for this to be formally noted in the minutes. The findings of the committee will be publicly reported in 2-3 months.

Members were informed that UK Sport's business case for 2012 funding had been presented to Treasury officials on a number of occasions. It stood up to detailed scrutiny and complimentary responses had been received. The decision and timing of any funding announcement was now in the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and it was not possible to give any indication of when this might be. Members expressed a desire that UK Sport's role in supporting medal success in the lead up to Beijing be clarified with the public and press. The Chair noted this for action within the Communications Department and advised of several press communications in action, including a meeting with the Editor of the Daily Telegraph on the 24th March, with Nick Bitel, to discuss issues relating to UK Sport's business.

Members also stated that should a lower than expected funding figure be announced by the Chancellor, UK Sport would need to be extremely clear in its communications about the implications of that decision in relation to the funding of success in 2012. Members were clear in their direction that UK Sport should express 'disappointment' in any decision that did not match up to the 'ultimate goal' in the Funding Submission. Tim Hollingsworth informed the Board that a 100-day action plan was being assembled to ensure clarity with NGBs and partners about the steps UK Sport would take following any announcement of funding.

11.2 One Stop Planning Meetings 2005

Liz Nicholl took Members through paper UKS 18 2006 which reflected feedback from participants in the One Stop Plan process that had been in place since early 2001. The paper raised questions to address ways of progressing this work more effectively and efficiently.

It was noted that Chief Officers of home country sports councils supported the paper when it was discussed at a recent CGCO meeting. Members agreed to adopt the principles outlined in the paper and asked that a set of clear recommendations be brought to the next meeting.

11.3 Paralympic Performance Review

Mitch Hammond & Emyr Roberts joined the meeting.

Mitch Hammond discussed paper UKS 19 2006 with the Board. The following points were highlighted:

- 2005/6 is a transitional year for Paralympic sports- regrouping after Athens
- During the year the managed sport programme and the Fast Track programme were launched. Both programmes are progressing, and the Fast Track programme is identifying some new talent in sports that have not had underpinning programmes.
- Athletics, a key paralympic sport, has appointed a new Manager for Disability Athletics
- It is very difficult to predict medals at a Paralympic Games. No doubt China will be stronger than in Athens and will take medals away from every country including GB. Paralympic targets will need a significant review on an annual basis as competitor information emerges. There are ongoing problems with the classification system and UK Sport will be looking into how this can be improved for our athletes.
- The opportunity presented by the Paralympic World Cup needs to be maximised. Ownership lies with commercial operators and the degree of engagement of the BPA is low.
- A mapping process has taken place to get a high level vision of the paralympic pathway with UKS/BPA & YST. A clear consensus is emerging and gaps are being identified. Wales is making great strides in disability sports but there is a big gap in England at present that needs to be addressed.

11.4 Funding of SportsCoach UK

Emyr Roberts introduced paper UKS 20 2006 which provided an update on the work of sportscoach UK, detailed its position and future plans within the broader sporting landscape and recommended funding levels through to March 2009.

The Board acknowledged the recent positive momentum within the organisation created by the appointment of the new CEO Pat Duffy.

The Board noted the key role of scUK in leading on the development of the UK Coaching Certificate and recognised that the success of this project was crucial to the future of coach education. Members highlighted that the UKCC needed to accommodate the different requirements of professional and volunteer coaches and provide opportunities for coaches working in high performance and community/grass roots sport.

The Board welcomed the proposal from scUK to lead on the development of a new UK Action Plan for Coaching for the period 2006 – 2016 which would build on the previous UK Vision for Coaching and the work of the DCMS led Coaching Project Board and take into consideration the opportunities and challenges presented by London 2012 and beyond. A two day Coaching summit is scheduled for 25 / 26 April to progress the UK Action Plan for Coaching and the Board agreed that it might be useful for Pat Duffy to make a presentation at a future meeting to outline the action plan once agreed.

The Board discussed the important links between the broad coaching development work carried out by scUK and the world class coaching programme implemented by UK Sport and agreed that there was real merit in the proposal for scUK to appoint a lead officer to forge strong links with UK Sport, to guide scUK work in support of talent coaches working at home country and regional level and for scUK and UKS staff to work very closely together to inform coaching strategies from a top-down perspective.

Members supported the suggestion that UK Sport increase their association with the annual scUK Coaching Hall of Fame and Coach of the Year awards possibly through sponsorship of the two UK Coach of the year awards, with the sponsorship value being negotiated from within the agreed UK Sport grant award to scUK.

Members agreed the following recommendation:

- ***scUK receive an exchequer award of up to £500,000 for the year April 2006 – March 2007 with indicative planning figures of £425,000 for 2007/ 2008 and 2008/2009.***

11.5 Winter Olympic Results

Emyr Roberts tabled two short papers providing result information from the Turin Winter Olympics. The first paper provided an initial high level summary of results from the British athletes who had competed at the Winter Olympics in Turin. The overall team achievement of winning one silver medal was disappointing as the high level goal for UK Sport, for its winter sport investment was to win 2 / 3 medals. The number of top 10 results in Turin was however very encouraging and a significant improvement on top ten finishes at the 2002 games in SLC. The second paper outlined the specific results of every British athlete who competed at Turin.

Post Turin debrief meetings will take place in April with the BOA, with the new

plans for each sport for 2006 – 2010 to be submitted to UK Sport by 12th May. Further meetings with each sport are then scheduled for June to consider in detail the medal potential for the Vancouver winter games in 2010. Recommendations for funding awards for winter sports will then be considered by the UK Sport Board in July.

Alex Newton and Emyr Roberts left the meeting.

12. Drug Free Sport

12.1 National Tribunal Service for Anti-Doping

John Scott introduced paper UKS 21 2006 and noted that at the Chief Officers meeting a key concern had been the need for consistency in the application of the appeals process and that the lead in developing such a system had to lie with them in order to assure the necessary quality assurance. This was a key challenge addressed in the paper. He noted that the Government had endorsed the select committee recommendation that a National Tribunal Service be established. The challenge to the sports councils is how to go forward without a legal framework or a statutory mandate requiring sports to adhere to a single system. Only very elementary work had been done of the cost implications of such a system and this remained a concern. With the work undertaken by the SDRP and the opinion received from Michael Beloff QC some valuable material had been produced which could be taken forward by a working party established with board members and others.

The Board thanked Peter Smith for his hard work on developing this paper

The following recommendation was then agreed:

- ***To agree to establish a Working Group consisting of members of the Board, experienced individuals from selected sports, UK Sport representation, and an expert facilitator, to review the feasibility of establishing and operating a National Tribunal Service.***

12.2 NGB Agreements

John Scott introduced the paper UKS 22 2006 explaining it provided up to date information on progress with obtaining NGB sign-off on the NGB Anti-Doping Agreement. Apart from the so called big 4 sports excellent progress was being made with few major areas of concern. Any delays were more to do with the capacity of some of the sports to progress the application of the agreement and some minor issues of clarification in sports such as equestrian and modern pentathlon where horses were involved.

Thanks to the support and cooperation of Sport England UK Sport is seeking a conclusion with three of the big four sports. Football remains a challenge. The Chair and John Scott met with Brian Barwick, the CEO of the FA to explain our position and to listen to his concerns. His position is that the FA is committed to drug free sport but that unless the government makes compliance a legal requirement his sport is caught with its need to follow the rules of its IF. We still await the outcome of the opinion from CAS on the dispute between WADA and FIFA. It has however been made clear to the FA by both UK Sport and Sport England that the sports councils have every right to link funding to code compliance and that the Whole Sport Plan funding agreement with SE requires the FA to meet the requirements of the NGB Agreement by June or have their funding suspended.

The Board endorsed the position and noted that the home country FA's were taking a lead from the FA.

The Board also noted with concern Billiards and Snooker's intention not to comply with the Code. Officers will continue to pursue the body and seek their cooperation.

13. Policy

13.1 UKS Independent Appeals Process

Peter Smith joined the meeting.

Tim Hollingsworth introduced paper UKS 23 2006 which proposed the creation of a single appeals process for the use of all Sports Councils, and for appeals against sanctions imposed under the National Anti-Doping Policy. It was noted and agreed that an appeal could only be lodged against the process not the decision itself. An appeals panel consisting of Sports Council members separate from the decision making process with an independent chair was considered appropriate.

The Board was informed that separately the Chair of the Scrutiny Panel had commented on the paper, and he will be asked to review the final proposal, which would remove the term "independent" and take on board other comments. Only if the Scrutiny Panel raised further issues would the proposal return to the Board.

Subject to the above the recommendations were agreed.

13.2 National Recognition Policy

The proposed revised UK-wide National Recognition policy had already been approved by the Home Country Sports Councils. A significant change was that UK Sport would no longer have an executive role on recognising new sporting activities, which would be decided collectively by the Home Countries. All the Sports Councils would continue collectively to decide the recognition or de-recognition of UK/GB level Governing Bodies. Under governance structures at Appendix B, compliance with National Anti-Doping Policy should be a criteria where appropriate.

The revised National Recognition policy was agreed.

13.3 UKS Customer Complaints Procedure

Members noted paper UKS 25 2006

13.4 UKS / HCSC Consultation Process

Members noted paper UKS 26 2006 and its amendments and agreed the Protocol for Relations between UK Sport and the Home Country Sports Councils

14. AOB

None to report

15. Date of Next Meeting

It was agreed to schedule the extra Board Meeting to discuss the Business Plan and Budget 2006/07 on Tuesday 11th April 1000-1200 at UK Sport.

The next ordinary Board Meeting will take place on Wednesday 24th May 2006 1030-1300 at UK Sport.

As there was no further business to report the meeting closed at 1310