



Minutes of the UK Sport Board Meeting held on 2nd December 2008 at UK Sport

Present

Chair Sue Campbell

Attendees:

Philip Carling
Chris Holmes
Nigel Walker
Rod Carr
Jonathan Vickers
Michael Farrer

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
Andy Parkinson Acting Director, Drug Free Sport
Chris Walker Finance Director

In attendance

Andy Burnham MP Secretary of State (Item 8.2)
Phil French DCMS (Item 8.2)
Rita Patel DCMS (Item 8.2)
Simon Le Fevre Head of Operations, Perf Dir. (all)
Peter Keen Head of Performance (all)
Neil Page Investment Coordinator (Items 1-10.2)
Vijay Parbat Legal Advisor (Items 1-10.1)
Russell Langley Head of Communications (Items 1-10.1)
Simon Morton Acting Head of Major Events (Items 10.3-10.4)
Clare Hartley Events Consultant (Item 10.4)

Board Secretary

Aimee Twine UK Sport

1. Introduction and Apologies for Absence

Action

The Chair received apologies from Louise Martin and Dominic Walsh. Dominic Walsh had met with the Chair and CEO, joined by Louise Martin on conference call, on 1st December to discuss agenda items and feed in comments. Chair welcomed Jonathan Vickers as a new UK Sport Board Member and Michael Farrer as Acting Chair of Sport England to their first meeting.

Vijay Parbat, Neil Page, Russell Langley and Simon Le Fevre joined the meeting.

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.

Rod Carr declared an interest in Item 10 as CEO of RYA. Chair asked that he remove himself from discussion for the relevant sections of this item.

3. Approval of Minutes

Members agreed and signed off the minutes of 1st October as an accurate record.

4. Matters Arising

No matters arose for discussion.

5. Executive Team Report

Board were asked to approve the appointment of Nigel Walker as Chair of the Major Events Panel (MEP) following Nick Bitel's term expiring on 31st March 2009.

A number of other panel member's terms will expire on 1st February 2009. Following discussion, Members agreed that the MEP Chair and UKS Officers should identify a revised composition for the Panel to be brought back to the January Board meeting for ratification.

UKS

6. Board Events Calendar

Members accepted paper UKS 48 2008.

7. Performance

7.1 Mission 2012 Report

Liz Nicholl took Members through Paper UKS 49 2008 which was for information.

Members noted that a number of developments had taken place in the evolution of Mission 2012 process including:

- Placing a stronger emphasis on the quest for excellence, rather than the exposing of failure;
- Revision of traffic light definitions to focus on identifying elements of excellence and the significant challenges facing each sport;
- An emerging intention to match challenges with relevant expertise at the M2012 element level; and
- A more focused role for the Panels, for them to give a performance perspective on the emerging themes and advise on novel solutions to known challenges.

The paper outlined the sports' submissions for the fourth quarter cycle

which marked the full annual review point for most sports following Beijing. Given the uncertainty around funding, two sports (Olympic Fencing and Paralympic Table Tennis) had chosen not to submit on this occasion, having been given the option by UK Sport.

Two Paralympic sports (Fencing and Volleyball) were recorded as having overall 'red' ratings owing to a significant lack of athletes

Members discussed the concept of 'Red + Gold = Green' and the fact that sports were being encouraged to identify elements where there are challenges in their sport that might be 'red' with a view to being matched with sports with 'gold' standard good practice and expertise in these areas. Officers had found that sports were becoming increasingly willing to engage in this way. Members queried whether the cost of providing peer support would be allowed for and LN advised that the intention is to recognise excellence and reward support.

Members noted that the most common 'red' areas involved leadership (11 in total). Members asked therefore that Officers give priority to helping sports address this in the next year. LN confirmed that this would be given a high priority and advised that work was already underway to support recruitment.

The Board also noted that Officers were working out the extent to which a similar approach to Mission 2012 might be appropriate for the Winter Olympic Sports, although recognising that these sports were already well along the road to Vancouver in February 2010.

7.2 Olympic and Paralympic Targets for London 2012

LN introduced paper UKS 50 2008.

The paper outlined the new 'range' approach to sport specific targets for the London Olympics and Paralympics in 2012 and made recommendations on the UK Sport high level targets.

Members were advised that UK Sport had written, in a response to the PAC Report, that it would publish the confirmed funding for each sport for the 2009-13 period, and the proposed medal target for London 2012, in December 2008.

Members noted that UK Sport had made DCMS aware that UKS would be moving to a 'range' approach as Officers believe this reflects more accurately the precision with which such targets can be set. Officers had also met with sports in November to outline the new approach, which had been positively received.

The upper end figure in the target range represented what was judged by a sport to be possible on the basis of reasoned analysis and evidence, with the lower end being a performance below which they would judge their programme to have underperformed.

The sport specific ranges for 2012 would be refined throughout the cycle, and would remain a goal within each sport's plan until it became a firm agreed medal target in the Olympic/Paralympic Games year.

UK Sport is, however, committed to establishing and releasing an overall target for the Olympic and Paralympic Games based on the data provided by the sports. The estimated mid point of the sports target ranges (as submitted in their draft plans), had therefore been used to inform UK Sport's overall high level Olympic and Paralympic target setting for 2012.

Officers had also met with the BOA and BPA on the 1st December to talk through the process with a view to agreeing a consistent position. Both parties had agreed to endorse the approach.

Officers asked that Board endorse the following medal targets to be communicated at this point:

- 1. A high level target of top 4 in the medal table for the 2012 Olympic Games, with more medals being won across more sports;**
- 2. A high level target of second in the medal table for the Paralympic Games with more medals being won across more sports**

Following discussion, Board agreed the above approach and targets.

8. Finance

8.1 Financial Risks and Funding Contingencies for 2009-2013

John Steele introduced the presentation to set the context for decisions to be made later in the Board meeting. The agenda was outlined and Members were reminded of policy decisions already taken at previous Board Meetings, including confirmation of the Investment Principles. The approach taken internally and externally was also outlined.

Chris Walker then took Members through the financial framework. The UK Sport objective was to balance maximum investment in sports with financial security for the overall mission and UK Sport. The key steps were to consider income assumptions and associated risk management; agree underlying principles; and establish an upper limit for contingency plans. A final detailed budget for the cycle would be presented to the January Board.

UKS

The main strands of income and the related risks and assumptions were outlined. The main strands were National Lottery, Treasury (baseline and additional Grant-in-Aid); sponsorship; and End of Year Flexibility (EYF), together with a few smaller elements. Baseline Grant-in-Aid (GiA) was secured through to 2010/11 (i.e. for the current Comprehensive Spending Review period), although funding commitments were being made for the four year Olympic/Paralympic cycle.

The assumption was that the baseline funding for 2011/12 and 2012/13 will be maintained at the same absolute level as 2010/11. Assurance on this point had been sought from the Permanent Secretary, but only a limited response had so far been received. In respect of the Lottery strand, the full amount of income projected by DCMS – including the £21m additional upside – has been included in the budget. The impact was to expose UKS more directly and immediately to any reduction in projected Lottery income. The options to mitigate this risk were the lottery balance – which is already low and will be required to manage the cash flow risk across the cycle – and the Funding Agreement clause with sports to reduce awards already made. Members asked what could be done to provide accurate forecast data for lottery income and were advised that in addition to the DCMS forecast there was also a contact between UKS and Camelot which might assist.

Members were advised that the main areas of greatest uncertainty were around the £100m funding gap and £7m EYF, although the undertaking

from the Secretary of State announced that morning, meant that £20m for 2008/09 and a further £9m for the 2012 cycle were now secure.

Members suggested that most spend in 2012/13 will be in first two quarters and wondered whether this might be reflected in the financial model. It was agreed that this might be a useful point for the future. It was also noted that no separate funding allocation had been set aside for holding camps for the London Games, and sports would need to make adequate provision from within their own funding allocations.

Members were presented with a number of assumptions for inclusion in the budget, and **these were agreed by Board as follows:**

1. Provide £500,000 per annum general contingency to cover items such as rent review and any under-accrual for settlement of tax liabilities around Drugs Control Officer employment status.
2. Accept DCMS lottery income projection, including the £21m upside, with UKS bearing the risk of any shortfall.
3. Exclude EYF balance from budgeted income.
4. Commit fundraising income only to the extent guaranteed by DCMS.
5. Provide £1.8m for NADO transition costs.

Vijay Parbat outlined legal advice relating to the obligations of Members and Officers in exercising their decision making powers.

Chris Walker then drew together the current position reflecting the above, including the forecast UK Sport financial outcome for the current year of 2008/09 where a limited under-spend was projected, partially offset by additional investment in IT infrastructure and provision for settlement of a long standing dispute with HM Revenue & Customs on the tax status of Doping Control Officers. The latter had been reviewed in detail by the Audit Committee who recommended acceptance of the HMRC contention based on professional advice received from Deloitte.

8.2 Secretary of State

Andy Burnham MP, Phil French & Rita Patel joined the meeting.

The Secretary of State thanked the Chair and Members for the opportunity to attend and discuss funding decisions and extended thanks to the team at UK Sport for their patience through the recent difficult financial processes.

The SoS outlined the principles on which the Prime Minister had announced the 2006 funding package. Government felt now was the right time to re-assess the 2006 deal as DCMS were aware that there needed to be a certainty for sports in their funding figures. DCMS have been seeking this package outside of the spending review process and the SoS thanked the DCMS team for their work which has been incredibly difficult due to current economic circumstances and a changed public spending position.

However the SoS advised that a new package and revised deal for the London cycle had been achieved. The Secretary of State had spoken with the Chair the evening prior to Board to confirm that £50m in extra funding had been confirmed by DCMS and Treasury (comprised of £29m exchequer and £21m lottery third licence upside), to make a total funding amount of £550m which could inform any board decisions taken today. The SoS asked that it be noted that this is the absolute limit of public sector funding that can be given to elite sport in this country and no further public funds would be forthcoming.

The SoS outlined two conditions of the new funding package:

- That UK Sport make a serious and sustained effort towards establishing a private sector funding stream by taking ownership of private sector fundraising activity.
- That no sports be cut entirely adrift in any funding decisions taken.

With regard to private sector fundraising, the SoS outlined that UKS would lead, but would be supported by DCMS and receive guidance in terms of advice and expertise from LOCOG. This will be confirmed in the final funding letter to UKS.

The Chair extended her appreciation to the SoS for attending the meeting and the efforts made personally to achieve this package and promised that UKS would commit to working in partnership to meet the principles of the new deal.

The Chair also queried whether the funding for the modernisation of the NADO had been confirmed, and was advised that DCMS were currently still in discussions around this subject and are confident of a positive response.

The SoS advised that DCMS plan to make a public announcement later that day regarding the extra funding. UKS agreed and stated that it would release individual figures sport figures on the 3rd Dec.

Members asked the SoS if he would kindly pass on the Board's thanks to the Minister of Sport for his support during this process.

The Secretary of State, Phil French and Rita Patel left the meeting.

9. Drug Free Sport

9.1 Update on Modernisation of NADO

Andy Parkinson introduced the presentation which outlined some of the possible implementation scenarios and funding solutions for the NADO separation.

AP reminded Members that that the modernisation of the NADO would include the additional functions of case management and intelligence management with a desire to add an Athlete Biological Passport programme. The significant barrier to adding these functions continues to be the governance and physical separation of the NADO from UK Sport. The governance separation is key as the delegation of case management authority cannot occur without governance separation, even though it could occur without physical separation. Although very positive discussions have taken place with the Minister for Sport to try and seek assurance on the future operating budget of the NADO, and notwithstanding the statement earlier from the Secretary of State, to date no formal assurances have been received.

AP outlined four possible implementation scenarios and funding solutions for the NADO separation for consideration by Members. Members agreed that the preferable scenario would be that no transitional costs be contributed by UK Sport, but this might cause delay to implementation until funding assurances are received from DCMS. Members agreed the scenario that was currently preferable, which stated that UKS would have to provide the initial development costs of £1.8m with a caveat regarding DCMS assurances of future programme costs. Although this would mean financial risk for UKS, it would provide for a clear separation and modernisation of the NADO.

Following discussion, the Board therefore approved the use of £1.8m for the transition costs of the NADO project until further assurances were received from DCMS.

The Board also agreed that if there is no physical and governance separation of DFS from UK Sport, then a proposal including associated costs regarding how to further develop DFS' functions would be presented and considered at the January 2009 Board meeting.

UKS

10. 2009-13 Investment

Taking account of the information provided earlier by the Secretary of State, the Board recognised that UK Sport now needed to review and take funding decisions for the 2009/13 Olympic/Paralympic cycle in the knowledge of a funding gap which:

- currently stood at £50 million;
- would take time to fill from commercial sponsorship or other fund-raising initiatives; and
- which, even with best efforts, was unlikely to be fully filled in the prevailing economic climate.

10.1 Performance – Non-Olympic/Paralympic Sports and Partner Organisations

Liz Nicholl presented to Members the approach Officers had taken to consider where savings could be made in UKS grant award funding to Non-Olympic Sports and Partner Organisations, in order to maximise the funding available for UK Sport's current 2009-2013 Olympic and Paralympic investment focus. The aim was to achieve an overall saving with regard to these bodies of £3,600,000 over the 2009/13 cycle; of which at least £1,000,000 would be achieved by a reduction in the Major Events budget for the period.

In the case of Non-Olympic Sports, the Board noted the previous UK Sport funding policy agreed at its meeting in June 2008, and the discussions the Officers had held with the sports concerned as part of the review of contingencies following the October 2008 Board meeting. In the light of current circumstances, the Board agreed:

- To amend the funding policy so as to phase out grant awards to the remaining Non-Olympic/Paralympic sports to zero by 31st March 2013;
- To award Orienteering £500,000 for the four year period from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2013 (rather than £800,000 as previously budgeted); and
- To award Waterskiing £670,000 for the four year period from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2013 (rather than £670,000 as previously budgeted).

In the case of Partner Organisations, Members were advised where the possible areas for saving might be made within the current budget figures, and the Board requested Officers to come back with firm proposals to the meeting in January 2009. Pending these proposals, and taking account of TASS' need to align its scholarships with the academic year, the Board agreed to confirm the first annual grant award to TASS for the 2008/11 period at £3,000,000.

UKS

Vijay Parbat and Russell Langley left the meeting.

10.2 Performance – Olympic & Paralympic Sports

LN explained that, with the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver only some fourteen months away, it was proposed that funding awards for the sports concerned should remain unchanged. **The Board agreed this position.**

LN then explained the further work undertaken since the last Board meeting to refine proposals for the 2009/13 Summer Olympics/Paralympics grant funding awards:

- The attrition rate in the funding model had been reduced from 1.45/1.00 to 1.30/1.00. The implication is that sports must lose fewer athletes between development and podium levels and be better at conversion. Track records over the last cycle indicated that, together with the draw of London 2012, this should be manageable.
- Mission 2012 'system' budgets (e.g. EIS, Research & Innovation, Performance Lifestyle, Coaching) had also been reduced to be in proportion to sports' anticipated funding levels in order to capture further savings.
- 2012 target ranges from sports had been received and reviewed and compared to the targets assumed in the initial funding model allocation.
- The top down performance hierarchy of sports had been reviewed, with clear prioritisation of criteria and groups.
- The 'no compromise' approach, as presented to the October 2008 Board and in keeping with investment principles, had been applied to proposed investments, so that they still reflected what Officers believed to be necessary if Team GB is to be as successful as possible in medal winning sports.

It was proposed that funding then be allocated from the top down to the point at which it was insufficient to cover the next group of sports.

Rod Carr left the meeting due to declaration of interest. A spreadsheet was tabled showing the proposed allocation of individual funding for each sport. Following discussion, grant funding award allocations for the four year period 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2012 were agreed as in the attached appendix (A), subject to the terms, conditions and signature of the relevant Funding Agreements with the sports bodies concerned.

Rod Carr re-joined the meeting.

- It was also agreed that further consideration should be given to the appropriate approach to the non-optimum funding of the 'below the line' sports using the balance of funding (e.g. an equitable percentage approach or a bespoke solution for every sport) and that this should be referred back to the January 2009 Board meeting for decision.
- In the meantime, UK Sport should work with partners to maximise other resources that might be available, targeting support for athletes with best potential to achieve creditable performances

UKS

The Board noted that there would be no UK Sport grant funding allocation for Paralympic 7-a-side and 5-a-side football. The sport had other sources of income to draw on and had previously been in receipt of minimal UK Sport funding; and had been alerted to this possible outcome.

The Board noted the intention to apply the same approach to Wheelchair Tennis, but it was acknowledged that there might be a need to consider a phased approach which would enable UKS to have a negotiated handover

with the LTA.

TH then took Members through the proposed communications plan for the announcement, including the key messages and timetable for events. It was agreed that all NGBs and partners would be communicated with before the funding figures were made public. A list of funding would also be published to confirm spend and demonstrate transparency and accountability.

Members noted the process.

Michael Farrer, Simon Le Fevre, Tim Hollingsworth & Neil Page left the meeting.

10.3 Major Events – Proposed revisions to the current strategy

Simon Morton joined the meeting.

SM introduced paper UKS 52 2008. The paper highlighted key issues and actions for Board to agree with regard to the delivery of the World Class Events Programme (WCEP). These included:

- Formalisation of the core funding principles of the WCEP
- Prioritisation of the strategic programme of events
- Handling of the WCEP lottery commitment post 2012
- Composition of the ME Panel

SM outlined the revised funding principles of the WCEP which Officers will use to formalise and guide their work in making recommendations to Board. Members queried why one of the principles implied that Junior events will not be supported unless a compelling rationale was provided. SM advised that there was a need to prioritise investment on attracting and staging sporting events of major international significance at World and European level.

Members queried how closely the WCEP will align with performance opportunities in the build up to 2012. SM advised that there continues to be significantly increased alignment with performance objectives to maximise home advantage, but that these new principles will allow some scope for investing in major events that deliver against supporting objectives.

The Board endorsed the funding principles for the WCEP.

SM talked Members through the process that the WCEP had taken on board to prioritise events in the current programme. The prioritisation work had focused WCEP investment on Olympic and Paralympic sports in the 2012 Olympiad.

There are 110 events currently identified in the programme which had been placed into five priority categories against an assessment of the funding principles outlined above.

The Board endorsed the approach.

Finally SM asked Members to endorse the strategy for investing in major events beyond 2012 as outlined in the paper. Members queried whether Officers should be budgeting funds that are not as yet available and asked that such a caveat be included in all applications. Members also asked that Officers undertake early risk assessments surrounding infrastructure when

compiling bids so far into the future.

Following discussion, the Board recommended that Officers work towards progressing applications for support of the events outlined, up to a total potential lottery investment of £3.5m. A full events strategy for the period 2013-2016 will be developed in dialogue with the NGBs and brought back to the Board for full consideration at a future meeting.

UKS

10.4 Major Events – Panel Minutes and Recommendations

Clare Hartley joined the meeting.

CH introduced paper UKS 53 2008. The paper contained recommendations from the ME panel meeting on 22nd October 2008. Three event application papers were presented for recommendations but since the Panel, there had been subsequent developments around two of these applications that officers wished to highlight to Board members.

Paralympic World Cup (PWC)

At the meeting, Panel Members had agreed a recommendation for £350k (£135k less than Officers requested) to fund the 2009 PWC. The reduced level of award was made as the Panel was disappointed with the position taken by PWC Ltd on sponsorship income and event review. Panel Members and Officers were also aware that the PWC were close to confirming a deal with commercial sponsors so did not require as much funding as requested. However, since the MEP on the 22nd October, UKS Officers have met with organisers and been informed that it is unlikely that the commercial income will materialise. Therefore having a deficit of £135k will lower the elite competition standard for athletes and therefore lower the value for money from the event.

Members were informed by Officers that they have de-committed £40k which had not been used in the '08 event. Board agreed following discussion that de-committed funds could be re-forecast against the 2009 event, resulting in an award of £445k, which leaves a deficit of £40k on the original request. Members requested that Officers proceed with this decision but note that a full review regarding funding of this event be undertaken from 2010 onwards.

Board agreed the following conditions:

- **UK Sport will claw back the first £95k (the level of increase from £350k to £445k) of any additional net commercial / sponsor income (over and above the £40k deficit from the UK Sport award) not already identified in the event budget. After that, standard UK Sport terms and conditions to apply to the award regarding claw back of any surplus including any generated by the potential new sponsorship income i.e. £100k net sponsorship would see the first £40k to the event and £60k back to UK Sport.**
- **A full review of UK Sport investment into Paralympic Events will be led by UK Sport officers to fully review the benefits of PWC and other major events from 2010 onwards. This will take place in early 2009 and will be driven by those sports which have strong performance programmes and a requirement for major competition.**
- **Written agreement of the event title 'Paralympic World Cup' from LOCOG**
- **Written agreement that the BBC will broadcast the event**

- **PWC needs to demonstrate the steps taken and evidence the strength of International Competition through all sports at the 2009 event.**

Members agreed that the incoming Chair of the ME Panel, Nigel Walker, would speak with the present Chair and panel members to convey the Board's decision. Members wished for it to be noted that this reversal of decision was entirely based on new information that has come to light and for it to be acknowledged that the presentation given to the ME Panel by PWC had been unsuitable.

FIVB World Tour Beach Volleyball 2009 - London

An original application had been made to the ME Panel from Live Nation, in partnership with Volleyball England, for a grant from UK Sport of £320k for the above event. Following consideration of the application, the Panel made a recommendation for a reduced award of up to £220k. A number of conditions were made alongside that recommendation.

Since the Panel meeting a number of issues have come to light, namely a change of date and venue which were vital to the business model. These two changes to the application have major financial, logistical and strategic implications, and therefore officers are recommending that Board reject the recommendation made by Panel. Officers have discussed this position with the Chair of the Panel who has agreed with this position. **Board agreed to reject the recommendation.**

Board also accepted the recommendation detailed below:

2010 BMX World Championships

- **Members agreed to provide a grant contribution of up to £300,000 towards the staging of the BMX World Championships 2012, of which £120,000 is ring-fenced as the event contingency and only to be released with the agreement of the officers and should meet the standard conditions of award and the specific conditions as recommended in the Paper.**

Members noted the following awards made by the Chief Executive and under the authority delegated by Board:

- **that UK Sport provide a grant of up to £88,000 towards the staging of the LEN European Junior Synchronised Swimming Championships 2009, in Gloucester**
- **that UK Sport provide a grant of up to £150,000 towards the staging of the Women's Rugby World Cup 2010, in South West London.**

Clare Hartley and Simon Morton left the meeting.

11. AOB

Liz Nicholl, Andy Parkinson, Chris Walker and Peter Keen left the meeting.

JSt outlined as per the Executive Team Report, the changes that Officers were seeking to make to the Executive Team. It is proposed that a Performance Director role is introduced to compliment a revised Director of Elite Sport role. Following discussion, the Board endorsed the approach.

Chair thanked Members for their input to the meeting and as there was no

further business, the meeting closed at 3pm.

12. Date of Next Meeting

Thursday January 29th 2009, 0930-1500

DRAFT SUBJECT TO BOARD APPROVAL

Appendix A

Olympic & Paralympic Sports	Total Performance Pathway 2009/13 Budget Allocations
Rowing AB	£27,470,000
Cycling AB	£26,922,700
Swimming AB	£25,606,000
Sailing AB	£23,389,800
Athletics AB	£25,110,900
Canoeing	£16,289,000
Equestrian AB	£13,651,900
Swimming Para	£10,057,500
Athletics Para	£6,644,700
Cycling Para	£3,845,500
Equestrian Para	£3,666,700
Archery Para	£2,187,500
Boxing	£8,022,300
Rowing Para	£2,366,700
Mod Pent	£6,411,400
Shooting Para	£2,111,700
Boccia	£2,366,700
Gymnastics	£10,332,100
Taekwondo	£4,488,300
Basketball Para (Men)	£3,549,700
Badminton	£8,631,700
Diving	£6,655,300
Archery AB	£4,496,700
Powerlifting	£1,107,500
Judo Para	£1,313,700
Table Tennis Para	£1,623,300
Judo AB	£7,636,200
Sailing Para	£1,775,000
Triathlon	£5,392,600
Hockey	£14,128,700
Rugby	£2,393,900
Synchro Swim	£3,457,600
Basketball AB	£8,751,800
Tennis Para (see note below)	£574,200

(* In sports where there are both Olympic and Paralympic programmes, these are distinguished in the table above as 'AB' and 'Para' respectively.)

- Olympic sports yet to receive an award allocation: Fencing; Handball; Shooting; Table Tennis; Volleyball; Water Polo; Weightlifting; Wrestling
- Paralympic sports yet to receive an award allocation: Fencing; Goalball; Volleyball and Wheelchair Basketball (women)
- The Figure for Wheelchair Tennis covers first two years of the cycle, with discussions to progress with LTA about self-funding from that point.