



# Minutes of the UK Sport Board Meeting held on 25th June 2008 at UK Sport

## Present

**Chair** Sue Campbell

## Attendees:

Philip Carling  
Chris Holmes  
Nigel Walker  
Rod Carr  
Nick Bitel  
Louise Martin  
Dominic Walsh On behalf of Sport Northern Ireland  
Ged Roddy On behalf of Sport England

## UK Sport Staff

John Steele Chief Executive  
Tim Hollingsworth Director of Policy & Communications  
Liz Nicholl Director of Elite Sport  
David Cole Business Support Director  
John Scott International Director, Director Drug Free Sport

## In attendance

Andy Burnham MP Secretary of State, DCMS (Item 7.1)  
Richard Caborn MP President, ABAE (Item 8.4)  
Paul King CEO, ABAE (Item 8.4)  
Will Calvert Head of Finance (Item 7)  
Simon Le Fevre Head of Operations - Performance (Item8)  
Peter Keen Head of Performance (Item 8)  
Alex Newton Performance Manager (Item 8)  
Janet Carter Investment Manager (Item 8)  
Peter Smith Policy Manager (item 8.2)  
Vijay Parbat Legal Advisor (Items 7.4, 8.1, 8.2, 8.5 & 8.6)

## Board Secretary

Aimee Twine UK Sport

## 1. Introduction and Apologies for Absence

### Action

The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting.

Chair congratulated Louise Martin on her appointment as Chair of Sport Scotland.

## **2. Declaration of Interest**

Members were reminded of the need to declare their interest in any items requiring a decision and to remove themselves from such decision making.

No declarations were received.

## **3. Approval of Minutes**

Members agreed the minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> May 2008 as an accurate record.

## **4. Matters Arising**

Members queried whether the TASS KPIs were available as per Item 4 and were advised that a draft had only been received from Tim Lawler on 24<sup>th</sup> June with an apology for their lateness. Once reviewed by the Performance Team, these will be circulated to Members for information.

UKS

Members asked for an update on the Points Based System for Managed Migration under Item 5. John Scott advised that the International team were pursuing with the Home Office but further clarification was required which was anticipated mid summer. Further information would be brought to the next meeting.

UKS

## **5. Executive Team Report**

John Steele introduced the Executive Team Report highlighting the following areas:

- JSt asked for Board approval for Andy Parkinson to be appointed as Acting Director of Drug Free Sport following the departure of John Scott. This will initially be for a six month period. Members accepted the proposal.
- Basketball – Liz Nicholl updated Members on the plans regarding British Performance Basketball (BPB) Ltd, a wholly owned subsidiary of UK Sport, and its reintegration with British Basketball Federation (BBF). In order to retain momentum and expertise, BPB will transfer over to become a subsidiary of BBF. BBF, the recognised Governing Body, will become dormant and the constitution of BPB will be amended to create a new Board as agreed by BPB and BBF. Members noted and agreed to this change. Members queried whether there were any TUPE or tax implications with the transfer. UKS will ensure that these points are investigated and clarified.

UKS

## **6. Board Events Calendar**

Members accepted paper UKS 28 2008.

## **7. Finance**

### **7.1 Andy Burnham MP, Secretary of State, DCMS**

Chair welcomed Andy Burnham to the meeting.

The Secretary of State thanked the Chair and Members for the invitation to attend the meeting.

He outlined the current position of DCMS with regard to funding for 2012 and assured Members that he understood the difficult position they were in having to make decisions with no confirmation of funding, but that it

remains the highest priority of DCMS to focus on raising sponsorship for 2012.

He stated that contrary to press reports there was currently no assurance for the money from Treasury, and his focus was now on what could be done to raise the money.

Members were advised that progress was being made and that a scheme focused around leveraging athlete appearances was currently being developed with Fast Track with the hope of launching around Beijing. Although the department are aware that there are similar schemes in the market place, they feel this scheme is the only way for athletes to 'give back' on the substantial investment in them through the WCPP and support preparation of the 2012 team. While the Department was looking at other options, this scheme was currently the main focus of their activity.

A question and answer session then focused principally on issues relating to the proposed scheme. Members expressed concerns over the time commitments expected from athletes and the short time frame available to raise funds, as well as the scheme's ability to raise the amount needed. The SoS agreed that it may not make the whole amount but stressed that some action was needed now and this was the best option. He also agreed that balance and flexibility was the key in implementing the scheme, but it was hoped that athletes would recognise the importance of their commitment to it in recognition of the public funding they received.

Members also raised concerns over the impact on NGBs, both in terms of their existing sponsors and the need for them to enforce the proposed athlete scheme. The SoS acknowledged these concerns and said that it would be very important for NGBs to get involved and everyone should work together to ensure that this scheme was a priority but was managed in a flexible manner.

The SoS stated that he was aware of the timeline to the December Board with regard to funding decisions and suggested that the period after Beijing would be critical in terms of the decisions made. He suggested that he return again in the Autumn to update on progress. Members thanked SoS very much for attending and updating on the current situation, acknowledged the positive moves forward that are now being made and the focus that the SoS is giving personally to the issue, and welcomed the invitation to meet again after Beijing to review progress.

## **7.2 Finance Report/Year End Accounts**

Will Calvert joined the meeting

WC tabled the full Annual Report and Accounts for 07/08 which had been recommended for Board approval by the Audit Committee and outlined the key points (including the findings of the National Audit Office).

Board approved the accounts for sign-off by the Chair and Accounting Officer. Chris Holmes (Chair of Audit Committee) thanked WC and the Finance Team for their work to date.

## **7.3 UKS role and structure moving forward**

John Steele advised Members that the UK Sport Mission and Core Purposes were being re-visited in light of the proposed NADO separation. While not being seen as a restructure or change of strategic direction, this was an opportune time to re-shape the organisation, and JS asked for input from

Members on their thoughts of the future shape of UK Sport. Members will be contacted individually over the summer to share their ideas.

UKS

## **7.4 Update on DCMS/Fast Track £100m Private Investment Scheme**

TH introduced item 7.4 and gave Members a verbal update on UK Sport's position going forward and current key issues regarding the DCMS / Fast Track programme of activity. TH stated that while maintaining the organisation's position of not being responsible for the money being raised, UK Sport was very involved in the Department and Fast Track's thinking and doing everything it could to support it to ensure a positive outcome for Olympic and Paralympic sport.

TH highlighted in particular the work being done by UK Sport to support thinking around the proposed 'athlete involvement' scheme – including the advice given with regard to number of days and some of the potential challenges faced by the scheme, such as its impact on athlete taxation status, the requirement to change the Funding Agreements with NGBs and the cost and potential complexity of managing such a scheme effectively.

Members welcomed the update and noted both the opportunities and challenges that the proposed athlete involvement scheme might create. They recognised the need to ensure that any existing contracted days are fully utilised and stated the view that while the principle of an athlete based scheme could be supported, it was vital that it did not upset either the athletes' focus on training and competition or the overall balance of the relationship between UK Sport and NGBs.

## **8. Performance**

### **8.1 2009-13 Summer Olympic/Paralympic Funding Model Proposals**

Peter Keen, Janet Carter, Simon Le Fevre and Alex Newton joined the meeting.

LN introduced the presentation to Members. The aim was to explain proposed strategy, funding model and principles for investment in 2009/13 (including results of EIS Strategic Review) and to provide sufficient knowledge and confidence to delegate responsibility for calculating and issuing sport specific planning figures post Games.

The presentation was in three parts. The first took Members through the investment model that was applied in 2006 when the new 2012 funding was allocated for the current Olympic/Paralympic cycle. The second took Members through recommended principles that had emerged from a thorough review of strategic activity and investment in the current cycle, including:

- Lessons learnt from the experience of working with the 'new' sports
- The economic environment and the challenge of the £100m and reliance on fluctuating Lottery income.
- The EIS review including the approach to SS/SM service provision and Performance Lifestyle support
- The emerging findings of the Paralympic review
- Evidence of gaps and opportunities from the Talent Health Check
- The Pre-Games holding camp investment
- The risks relating to the Athlete Medical Scheme

The third part then set out proposed changes to the investment model for 2009-13 and a high level breakdown of the proposed 2009-13 performance budget.

PK then outlined the following 10 principles supporting the strategy, explaining the proposition and potential implications of each one.

1. Clarity of UK Sport Performance Mandate to 2012
2. Investment decisions must reflect the economic realities of our time
3. WCPP Funding is a Privilege and not a Right
4. The level of excellence attained by 2012 will be the primary legacy of our investment
5. A clear more focused remit for the EIS
6. Performance Lifestyle support should be available to all athletes and WCP staff
7. Talent ID and transfer remains a key priority but requires specialist staff and skills and high profile campaigns
8. A more flexible, pragmatic approach to investing in Paralympic sports
9. Other UKS performance investments aligned to underpin and support the pursuit of excellence
10. Greater coherence, teamship, openness and accountability across the system in support of our athletes

Members commended the presentation. After discussion, Members then agreed to the principles, with the caveat that the Performance Lifestyle support for WCP staff is 'in consultation with the NGB', and agreed to give Officers delegated authority, within those principles, for calculating and issuing sport-specific planning figures post-Games. Details of the planning figures would be shared with Board at the October meeting and contingency plans would be revisited and re-presented at that meeting. Members would then be asked to confirm awards at the December meeting.

UKS

As part of their agreement, Members specifically approved the changes to the strategic approach of and investment in the English Institute of Sport following the review carried out over the past six months (as highlighted in Principle 5), and commended the work done by the Review Board.

## **8.2 Policy on Consequences for Breach of UK Sport Agreements**

SLF introduced a brief paper, UKS 30 2008. The Board reviewed the policy on consequences for breach of UK Sport Grant Funding Award Agreements, taking into account the funding model proposals previously discussed and looking forward to the drafting of 2009/13 Funding Award Agreements. The Board then agreed:

- to confirm its 'in principle' agreement with UK Sport having an appropriate consequences policy for breaches of contract in respect of its Grant Funding Award Agreements, but noted that the current policy statement and 'tariff' schedules needed further revision before publication and implementation;
- to support the approach of UK Sport officers in exploring additional options that might allow the proposed 'intervention' elements of the policy to function more effectively, including an 'investment' option, where - in the event of a breach - UK Sport Grant Awards investment funding could be specifically directed by the tightening or addition of Award conditions;

- to support the approach of UK Sport officers in clarifying UK Sport's existing regulatory status and identifying any relevance to the 'consequences' policy.
- to give UK Sport officers discretion to determine, with appropriate legal advice, the relative advantages and disadvantages of:
  - incorporating a 'tariff' of 'consequences' in the UK Sport Grant Award Funding Agreement or of having this as part of general terms and conditions that could, if necessary, be varied by the Board at its discretion from time to time; and
  - having a more, or less, highly specified tariff.

The Board noted that UK Sport Officers would report back to the October meeting of the UK Sport Board.

UKS

### **8.3 M2012 Q2 2008 Update**

LN introduced paper UKS 31 2008 advising that the second quarter had primarily been a 'light touch' submission cycle, given the focus on Beijing, and there is now a break until Q4-08 in November, linked to post-Games reviews.

LN highlighted the progress on key themes and actions and that there is growing evidence that sports are engaging more fully and positively with the process. Members noted the outcomes of the recent submissions, the traffic light changes for Olympic Fencing, Paralympic Sailing and Sitting Volleyball and the fact that NGBs will have received their formal written feedback to comment on for the tracker board, which will be revealed at a media briefing on 2 July.

Members discussed the overall red submissions that had been submitted to Board. Boxing will be discussed as a separate item.

#### **Weightlifting**

Liz Nicholl provided a verbal update on the situation regarding the Performance Programmes for Olympic Weightlifting and Paralympic Powerlifting, both rated 'red' by the Panels.

The Board took note of the following developments since its previous meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2008:

1. An underspend from a separate area of UK Sport activity, no longer required for its previous purpose, had become available and could now make possible an opportunity for UK Sport to provide "one off" financial investment to assist the sport in achieving outcomes which would help to secure the continuation of the current Performance Programmes for Paralympic Powerlifting and Olympic Weightlifting.
2. Research by UK Sport Officers indicated that the cost and complexity of a potential closure of current sport association structures, and of any UK Sport assistance to the sport of weightlifting to set up successor structures, could be significantly greater than previously anticipated.
3. Suggestions from World Class Lifting Ltd, via its Quarter 2 – 2008 Mission 2012 Submission, that WCLL or another body might act as an 'interim' NGB, were not considered practicable, as research by UK Sport indicated that WCLL or another body would almost certainly

have to take on the broader membership and anti-doping responsibilities from BWLA, in the event of the latter's ceasing to function for any reason.

4. BWLA had reported that additional investigation had shown its financial position to be a little better than previously thought.
5. BWLA Directors, WCLL Directors and UK Sport Officers were currently working together to develop the sport's drive to achieving financial viability, which was planned to include:
  - a. BWLA implementing strategies to broaden its income base from membership fees, service provision and other sources, including possible advice and benefit-in-kind support from BWLA's FTSE-100 Partner;
  - b. BWLA setting up suitable arrangements to manage its English activities in such a way as to facilitate BWLA's eligibility for Sport England grant funding awards;
  - c. cost savings and operational efficiencies from co-locating BWLA and WCLL in Leeds; and
  - d. (in recognition of the interdependence between the two companies) WCLL moving into the BWLA group legal structure as a subsidiary company, through which the UK Sport grant award funding for the Olympic Weightlifting and Paralympic Powerlifting World Class Performance Programmes would continue to flow and be managed (which was the structure originally contemplated and agreed between the sport and UK Sport).

The UK Sport Board agreed:

- to authorise UK Sport Officers to exercise discretion to allocate up to £130,000 as a "one off" award to BWLA to support the sport in achieving the outcomes of the plan outlined in (5) above;
- that UK Sport would continue to monitor progress through the Mission 2012 process; and
- that future Performance Programme grant funding awards to the sport will be subject to the usual scrutiny for the period 2009/13.

### **Sitting Volleyball**

The Panel amended the overall traffic light rating for Sitting Volleyball (and the three dimensions) to red due to the overall lack of progress in the sport. The Panel acknowledged that the sport is a relatively low priority but suggested that a short term plan from the sport be produced to provide some detail on management structure, clarity on roles and responsibilities, decision making structure and aspirations.

**The Board accept the recommendations from the Panel for a short term plan and that UK Sport officers should investigate the possibility of BPPS support for the sport.**

Members also considered funding recommendations for Goalball and Wheelchair Rugby that had not been considered by the M2012 Panels as it is not within their Terms of Reference, it being the responsibility of Officers and the Board. The need had emerged through M2012 reviews and the Paralympic recommendations complement the Paralympic review.

### **Goalball**

Since the last Board meeting Goalball has moved from overall red to amber.

At that meeting it was agreed that the existing award be reviewed to ensure it is athlete/coach focussed and that any further funding decisions be aligned with the outcomes of the Paralympic Review.

An anticipated funding shortfall of **£33,340** has been identified in relation to the delivery of this programme in 2008/09. This is made up of £12,500 required to support the part year costs of a full time manager/coach appointment, with the remainder being used to fund a comparative individualised support programme to those athletes not in receipt of TASS 2012 currently, and to pick up the shortfall for TASS 2012 athletes once their awards finish in September 2008.

**Officers recommended that underspend be used to fund an additional award of up to £33,340 to British Blind Sport (managed through BPPS) to support the Goalball programme in 2008/09. Board accepted the recommendation.**

#### **Paralympic – Wheelchair Rugby**

The Wheelchair Rugby submission highlighted the loss from September this year of a charitable funding stream from BOOST, which has been used to assist the sport with its development, and which will leave up to a £30,000 gap in the budget for the remainder of 2008/09.

**Officers recommended that underspend be used to fund an additional award of up to £30,000 to Great Britain Wheelchair Rugby to support the programme in 2008/09. Board accepted the recommendation.**

### **8.4 Boxing Update**

Richard Caborn MP (ABAE President) & Paul King (ABAE CEO) joined the meeting.

Liz Nicholl updated Members on progress on the points outlined in the letter sent to Paul King (circulated with Board papers) conveying Board's decision at the last meeting and on the meeting of LN and JSt with the programme coaches and athletes and subsequently with the ABAE Board and President.

As requested by Board, UK Sport had put interim programme support arrangements in place, Alex Newton (Performance Manager) having been deployed to support the coaches and athletes preparing for Beijing.

ABAE Board had agreed there was a dysfunctional relationship with the Performance Management Group and were working on alternative plans by early September.

At an audit focused meeting on Friday it had been agreed that a separate bank account will be established for the programme funding.

Some of the outstanding information had now been provided regarding the £75,000 award. This was being reviewed and there was now more confidence that this would be resolved in the near future.

One of the disciplinary matters still remains outstanding and the previous Friday, ABAE had confirmed that this would take a further two/three weeks.

There was no evidence of a change of climate within the programme in relation to support for boxers and coaches.

RCab thanked LN/ JSt for attending the ABAE Board meeting and gave an

overview of some of the achievements of the sport in terms of medals, Olympic qualification, the challenges of professionalism and the growth in club and school membership. RCab referred to the willingness of ABAE to fund the programme, in advance of a formal UKS/ABAE agreement being in place, as evidence of ABAE commitment; raised concerns regarding the Management Audit (at which stage PKi circulated the ABAE's response); confirmed that an ABAE Audit Committee is being established; and referred to other structural and reporting changes being needed post-Beijing.

Discussion followed regarding UK Sport's concerns and the impact on the climate of the programme. ABAE needs to create a culture and environment for athletes to excel, feel valued and inspired to remain amateur through to 2012. Their success must not be compromised. Support between now and Beijing needs to be faultless. Any alternative management structure must be small, focused, competency based and fit for purpose.

After the departure of RCab/PKi, Board considered its position and agreed that setting up a subsidiary of UK Sport post-Beijing is still the best option for managing the short to medium term risks while ABAE addresses the necessary changes. The Chair agreed to follow this up with RC and seek a way forward. All agreed that no action should be taken prior to Beijing that would distract the coaches and athletes preparing for the Games.

UKS

## 8.5 Winter Sport Review

LN introduced paper UKS 33 2008. The purpose of the paper was to provide Board with a status report on the performances against targets for British Winter Olympic and Paralympic Sports and to consider and agree world class pathway award recommendations for the winter Olympic and Paralympic sports for the final two years of the current cycle.

Members queried whether there was a similar process of Mission 2012 for the 2010 Winter Games sports and were advised that there was not, but the M2012 profiling tool had been provided to all the winter sports to help them evaluate their own programmes and work would continue to share knowledge and experience. It was also suggested there could be performance gains if some talent ID initiatives were targeted at bobsleigh and this would be considered by officers.

The Board considered and agreed, subject to DCMS approval of financial 'carry over', the following recommendations:

<b>Bob Skeleton</b>	<b>In addition to the four year world class pathway award of £1,595,000 (£797,500 for two years), award additional programme funding of £90,000 over the next two years (plus an APA).</b>
<b>Curling</b>	<b>In addition to the four year world class pathway award of £720,000 (£360,000 for two years), offer an additional award of £42,000 to support enhanced APA funding during 2008 – 2010.</b>
<b>Ice Skating Short Track</b>	<b>Confirm the two year planning figure as a world class pathway award of £260,000 for 2008 – 2010 and agree an additional programme award of £240,000 over the two years (plus two APAs)</b>
<b>Snowboard</b>	<b>Confirm the two year planning figure as a</b>

	<b>world class pathway award of £90,000 for 2008 – 2010.</b>
<b>Ice Skating Figure</b>	<b>Confirm the two year planning figure as a world class pathway award of £180,000 for 2008 – 2010</b>
<b>Bobsleigh</b>	<b>Confirm the two year planning figure as a world class pathway award of £180,000 for 2008 – 2010 subject to the resolution of finance and restructuring challenges.</b>
<b>Alpine</b>	<b>Confirm the withdrawal of funding for the Men’s Alpine Programme and confirm an award of £90,000 for Women’s Alpine for 2008 - 2010</b>
<b>Disability Curling</b>	<b>In addition to the four year world class pathway award of £270,000 (£135,000 for two years), agree additional programme funding of £175,000 over the next two years</b>
<b>Paralympic Alpine</b>	<b>Confirm the two year planning figure as a world class pathway award of £40,000 for 2008 – 2010 and agree an additional award of 125,000 over the next two years</b>

## **8.6 Non-Olympic Performance Investment Policy**

LN introduced paper UKS 34 2008 which was seeking the Board’s approval to confirm the existing investment policy for non-NGB organisations and non-Olympic/Paralympic sports in the coming 2009-2013 period.

### **Recommendation**

- **UK Sport confirms the current policy for investing in non-NGB organisations (discretionary, within the criteria described in paragraph 2a of the paper); in non-Olympic sports (on the basis of the criteria listed in paragraph 3 of the paper); and in non-Paralympic sports (on the basis of the criteria set out in paragraph 4 of the paper) for the 2009-2013 period.**
- **UK Sport clarifies the definition of the second non-Olympic sports criterion, requiring non-Olympic sports to be funded by at least two Home Country Sports Councils, as meaning to be in receipt of specific potential/development level pathway funding to underpin UK Sport’s performance investment.**

It was noted that the impact of adopting these recommendations would be a continuation of investment in the non-Olympic sports of waterskiing and orienteering, with very little likelihood of reinstating any of the five phased out sports.

The impact of adopting these recommendations would also be no investment in non-Paralympic sports or organisations, unless one or more such sport body is successful in coming under the Paralympic banner or in challenging UK Sport’s policy position. Any new funding for such a body would mean an additional call on the £420,000 funding available.

The above recommendations were agreed for the 2009-13 period.

Peter Keen, Janet Carter, Simon Le Fevre and Alex Newton left the meeting.

## **9. International**

### **9.1 Update on International Inspiration**

Cathy Reynolds & Debbie Lye joined the meeting

Members received a presentation on the International Inspiration Programme detailing progress with the project and the planned roll out of future phases. Members noted the significance of the project to the Olympic promise and the considerable progress that had been made by the International team in leading the project and securing funding and the cooperation of key partners.

Members thanked them for the update and congratulated them on work to date.

### **9.2 International Development Responsibilities**

John Scott & Debbie Lye introduced paper UKS 35 2008, which outlined a range of options and recommendations for the future organisation of the international development work.

DL outlined the three strands of the International programme: a grant-in-aid funded programme for sport development focussed on southern Africa; a charitable trust, IDS (UK); and the International Inspiration programme. In light of the scale of International Inspiration (II) funding, leading and managing such a significant externally facing programme and the decision to separate out UK Sport's anti-doping function, Officers felt it was timely to look at how to position International Development in relation to UK Sport's continuing roles and functions.

LOCOG has requested that UKS receive corporate sponsorship from Olympic Sponsors for the II Programme via IDS. The Premier League is using the same route for their contribution to the programme. LOCOG expects UK Sport to receive and manage these funds via a designated International Inspiration account within IDS (UK).

Four options for the future were put forward by Officers:

- Option A - Maintain the status quo and current organisation
- Option B - Continue to manage International Development within UK Sport, but separate from WCEP and International Policy in a specialist International Development unit
- Option C - Transfer all International Development activity, including International Inspiration and Grant-in-aid funded activities, to IDS (UK).
- Option D - Establish a limited company structure with charitable status and the transferred assets, commitments and charitable objects of IDS (UK) as a vehicle to manage all international development activities.

Members queried why Option D was favourable. Officers advised that establishing a limited company structure would reap benefits in efficiency of governance and provide the necessary confidence to funding partners as well being the most tax efficient option. A renamed body would also more

closely link the charity to UK Sport thereby extending its influence. This option also provides the necessary protection to Trustees.

Board considered the paper and agreed the following recommendations:

- **That Board endorse the importance of international development to the core responsibilities of UK Sport and the need for further exploration of how UK Sport's ongoing support for this activity can be further enhanced**
- **That Board approves further exploration of Option D as the basis for a firm proposal to be submitted to Board at the October meeting.**
- **That Board agrees, subject to the wishes of IDS (UK) Trustees, that the name of the trust could be changed to one that more closely aligns it to UK Sport. This is without prejudice to any organisational change. A name change now would enable IDS (UK) to enter into a licensing agreement with LOCOG without the complication of adjusting contracts and branding materials to accommodate a name change in the near future.**

#### **Next Steps**

- **To consult the current chair and trustees of IDS (UK) about these proposals, and**
- **To prepare and submit a firm proposal for UK Sport's position on this matter, including governance arrangements, operational structures, staffing and budget to Board in October.**

Cathy Reynolds and Debbie Lye left the meeting.

## **10. Major Events**

### **10.1 Major Events Panel Recommendations**

Members received and agreed the following recommendation from the Major Events Panel

#### **2008 UCI Track Cycling World Cup**

1. **That UK Sport provide a grant of up to £150,000 towards the staging of the UCI Track World Cup 2008, and in-principle support of the event in both the 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 seasons. The following conditions would be added to those detailed in Paper 01:**
  - **An explanation be received by UK Sport from Manchester City Council of the condition that £10,000 of their funding go towards the World Academy of Sport Education Programme.**
  - **A letter to be sent to British Cycling to explain that future support of the event may be jeopardised should it be felt by officers that any underperformance of the 2008 World Cup event was resultant from a BC policy of athlete selection**
  - **Any clawback position of any other public partner should be agreed by officers**

Members noted the following award made by the International Director and under the authority delegated by Board:

- **that UK Sport provide a grant of up to £90,000 towards the**

## **staging of the Sail for Gold Regatta 2008, in Weymouth**

### **11. Drug Free Sport**

#### **11.1 Update on Intelligence Testing**

John Scott introduced paper UKS 27 2008 on the learnings of the pilot phase of the Intelligence Testing approach to anti doping.

Members welcomed the approach and noted the findings.

#### **11.2 Position Statement on Supplements**

John Scott introduced Mike Stow who has led the work on supplements.

MS introduced paper UKS 38 2008 which outlined options for UKS to improve their stance with regards to better supporting athletes with their supplement choices.

MS noted that following consultation with key stakeholders in 2007, UKS had agreed to investigate the possibility of taking a greater role in the development of a scheme to minimise the risk of inadvertent doping through the use of supplements. Following investigation, two options were put forward for consideration:

- That UKS would own and badge a scheme that would assess product efficacy and contamination or
- Support the 'Informed Sport' programme currently led and owned by Horse Forensic Laboratory (HFL).

Following both internal and external legal advice on both options, Officers concluded that welcoming the approach being taken by the Informed Sport programme and revising the existing supplement position statement, would be the most risk-free way forward for UKS. Members discussed risks around contamination and the possible legal implications for UKS and were advised that there is no totally risk-free process for ensuring there is no supplement contamination, but as HFL owned the programme and UKS would only be 'welcoming the approach taken', legal opinion was that this was the most risk-free option. UKS would still promote the message that athletes should speak with Dieticians and Nutritionists regarding the use of supplements but felt this programme would offer a greater base of knowledge for athletes in decision making.

**Following discussion, Members approved a revision of the existing supplement position statement to reflect the presence of the Informed-Sport programme in the UK. Board were reassured that UKS would do everything to minimise risk.**

#### **11.3 Annual Report on Independent Scrutiny Panel**

The Chair introduced the Annual Report received from the Scrutiny Panel. Members noted its content and thanked the Panel for their work.

#### **11.4 Update on Modernisation of NADO**

John Scott gave Members a verbal update on the NADO Project.

UKS had received a response from the Minister to the business case submission in which he raised a number of questions and issues of process.

John Steele responded on 3<sup>rd</sup> June on behalf of UKS dealing with issues of funding, capacity and future management of the project. John Scott provided a rationale to questions on the detail of the business plan and future NADO functions.

John Steele's response had made clear that UKS has no extra resources to manage the next phase of the NADO project and that the UKS Board would need clear guidance on how to manage the migration should it be the Minister's wish that UK Sport assume such a responsibility.

DCMS officials advise that a response from the Minister is expected but if this is not received before the next Project Board Meeting (1<sup>st</sup> July), this meeting will be cancelled.

UKS

Members noted the report and thanked John Scott and the team for the excellent work on the Business Case. They requested that any response received from the Minister be shared ahead of the next Board meeting.

## **12. AOB**

As this was his final meeting, the Chair and the Board thanked John Scott for his contribution to UKS since its establishment and wished him all the best for his new appointment as CEO of Glasgow 2014.

JSt also thanked Board for their work, as employees of UKS felt supported by Board Members. Chair thanked Members for their input and all teams for inputting to Board meeting papers.

It was agreed that the next meeting, 1<sup>st</sup> October, would run until 1430hrs.

## **13. Date of Next Meeting**

**Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> October 2008, 1000-1430**