



Final Report

Stakeholder consultation



January 2015

CONTENTS

Contents	2
About UK Sport.....	9
Core responsibilities	9
Overview	11
Introduction.....	11
The purpose of consultation.....	11
This report.....	11
Methodology.....	12
Defining the stakeholder universe	13
Executive summary.....	14
Participant profile	17
Stakeholder workshops	17
Written submissions.....	20
Public responses	22
Public submissions.....	23
Key questions.....	26
Overview.....	26
1. The focus on medals	27
2. Breadth of remit	27
3. Longer term / deeper investment.....	27

4.	Additional measures of success	27
5.	Prioritising finite investments	28
6.	Further improvements	28
Question 1 – The focus on medals		29
Summary		29
1.1.	Arguments in favour of current approach.....	30
1.1.1.	High performance success is defined in medals.....	30
1.1.2.	Simplicity of objectives / avoiding dilution	31
1.1.3.	Medal success drives success in other areas.....	31
1.1.4.	Caveated arguments	32
1.2.	Arguments against current approach	33
1.2.1.	Medal success cannot be the “be all and end all”	33
1.2.2.	Re-interpreting ‘medal success’	34
1.2.3.	The principle of focusing on ‘high performance’ is wrong.....	35
Conclusions		36
Question 2 – Breadth of remit		37
Summary		37
1.3.	Arguments in favour of current approach.....	38
1.4.	Arguments in favour of changing remit.....	42
1.4.1.	Including non-Olympic / Paralympic sports of cultural importance	42
1.4.2.	Including all sports with a high standard of performance.....	43

1.4.3. Including additional disability sports events	45
1.5. Other observations	46
1.5.1. Alignment with non-Olympic disciplines in Olympic / Paralympic sports 46	
Conclusions	46
Question 3 – Longer term / deeper investment	47
Summary	47
3.1. Arguments in favour of current 8-year approach	48
3.2. Changes to current approach	50
3.2.1. A more ‘joined up’ approach	50
3.2.2. Adapting to specific challenges faced by team sports	56
3.2.3. Funding on development and community programmes.....	59
3.2.4. UK Sport responsible for entire talent pathway	61
3.2.5. Sports disadvantaged by current approach	62
3.2.6. Disadvantaged demographics	63
3.3. Other observations.....	64
3.3.1. Defining the pathway more clearly before agreeing changes	64
3.3.2. “Seed funding” very fast-growing sports	65
3.3.3. Identifying sports which have shorter or longer pathways to success.....	66
3.3.4. Differences between Home Nations.....	66
Conclusions	66
Question 4 – Additional measures of success	68

Summary	68
4.1. Performance measures	69
4.1.1. No additional measures	69
4.1.2. New medallists in emerging sports more valuable than other medals	71
4.1.3. Progress in sports in which it is harder to medal	72
4.1.4. The quality of facilities and the coaching setup	74
4.2. Non-performance measures	75
4.2.1. Participation	75
4.2.2. Societal impact	76
4.2.3. Creation of role models	78
4.2.4. Care and respect for individuals	79
4.2.5. Representation of women	79
4.2.6. Number of UK-based athletes and support staff	80
4.2.7. Cost per medal	80
4.3. The problem of measurement	81
Conclusions	81
Question 5 – Prioritising finite investments	83
Summary	83
5.1. Options in detail	83
5.1.1. Continue broadly with current approach	83
5.1.2. A ‘Balanced scorecard’ approach	87

5.1.3. Return to London2012 levels	90
5.1.4. Retain medal focus but rebalance towards Paralympics	91
5.1.5. Use secondary factors as “tie breakers”	92
5.1.6. Differentiation between team sports and individual sports	93
5.1.7. Weight up first or early medals in a sport.....	95
5.1.8. Prioritise investment in sports with social impact	96
5.1.9. Prioritise sports with widest reputational impact for UK.....	97
5.1.10. Baseline funding for ineligible sports	98
5.1.11. Baseline funding for all Olympic / Paralympic sports	98
5.1.12. Some spending earmarked for funding cross-sport initiatives	100
5.1.13. Separate funding calculations for men’s and women’s sport.....	100
5.1.14. ‘Parachute’ payments to aid transition when funding withdrawn.....	101
5.2. Other observations.....	101
5.2.1. Evidence-based approach.....	101
5.2.2. Further research into diminishing returns	102
Conclusions	102
6. Further improvements	104
Summary	104
6.1. Additional strategic observations in detail	104
6.1.1. No major strategic changes required	104
6.1.2. Drive more “joined up” approach across sport	105

6.1.3.	Separately address team sport issues	106
6.1.4.	Stronger narrative to promote publicly funded high performance sport 108	
6.1.5.	Attracting private investment	109
6.1.6.	Puncturing the ‘bubble’ around high-performance sport	109
6.1.7.	Assess whether Paralympic objectives are conflicting	110
6.1.8.	Introduce a new ethical framework.....	111
6.2.	Additional practical observations	112
6.2.1.	Continue with the current investment principles	112
6.2.2.	Clearer communication of role and criteria to sector stakeholders	112
6.2.3.	Set up a shared services facility.....	113
6.2.4.	Information sharing and collaboration.....	114
6.2.5.	Review of process to minimise duplication and waste	115
6.2.6.	Home Country Sports Institutes (HCSIs) and the EIS	116
6.2.7.	Measurement and impact assessment	117
6.2.8.	Incentives	117
6.2.9.	Innovation budget	118
6.2.10.	Plan decision-making timeframes early.....	118
6.2.11.	Universities taking on responsibilities of underdeveloped NGBs.....	119
6.2.12.	Leadership development.....	119
6.2.13.	Longer period for sports to prove progress	119
	Conclusions	120

Appendix 1: Glossary of terms	121
Appendix 2: Written consultation form.....	123
Appendix 3: Deliberative workshop plan	130
Introductions	130
Challenges and opportunities for high performance sport.....	130
Which sports should be considered eligible for UK Sport investment	131
Potential for longer term investment.....	132
What additional measures of success might we use?	132
How would you prioritise investment?.....	133
Other improvements / any other business	134
Appendix 4: Further reading	136
About ComRes.....	137

ABOUT UK SPORT

Established by Royal Charter in 1997, UK Sport is responsible for investing around £100 million of public funds each year – from both the National Lottery and the Exchequer – into high performance sport in the UK.

Accountable to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), UK Sport has a specific remit at the ‘top end’ of Britain’s high performance sporting pathway, with no direct involvement in community or school sport.

Based in London, it employs around 110 staff and is overseen by the UK Sport Board, comprising home country representatives and independent members, which meets every two months.

Core responsibilities

High Performance Sport

UK Sport is the strategic lead body for high performance sport in the UK. It invests Exchequer and National Lottery funds in Britain’s highest performing Olympic and Paralympic sports and athletes to maximise their chances of success on the world stage.

Using a philosophy which targets investment at those most likely to deliver medals at Olympic and Paralympic level, UK Sport works with each sport to provide the best possible support for athletes, providing everything they need from world-class coaches to cutting edge research and innovation, talent identification and Performance Lifestyle support.

Gold Event Series

The Gold Event Series is UK Sport’s major events programme for the period 2013–2019, and has been developed to help National Governing Bodies attract and stage some of the most important international sporting events to the UK, following the successful hosting of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.



Through the Gold Event Series, UK Sport will invest over £27m of National Lottery funding to help support the bidding and staging of major international sporting events up to 2019. A comprehensive range of new and expanded support services will also be provided to ensure that major events hosted in the UK are delivered to a world-leading standard.

International

UK Sport works with National Governing Bodies and other partner organisations to help them build positive working relationships with International Federations and other international bodies, helping ensure Britain has a voice on the world stage through the development of high quality administrators and professionals. UK Sport also has a dedicated Development team which works alongside international partners to deliver initiatives which harness the power of sport on a community level.

OVERVIEW

Introduction

UK Sport commissioned the independent research consultancy ComRes to conduct a consultation among its stakeholders at all levels, focusing on the organisation's strategic direction beyond the Rio 2016 investment cycle.

This consultation is one part of a wider process, including direct consultation between UK Sport and stakeholders/the public; informal conversations, a review of public statements, and general experience to date; as well as the internal review of strategic objectives and processes. The findings of this consultation will inform UK Sport's strategic review, alongside the additional information collected through other channels.

The purpose of consultation

Consultation is a two-way process of dialogue between an organisation and its stakeholders. As well as allowing the sharing of viewpoints, it is also designed to help both sides develop stronger and more empathetic working relationships. UK Sport commissioned the consultation and participated in its design and implementation; participants were not, however, led towards a particular viewpoint, and were free to state any case in their final submission.

This report

The consultation is not intended to be a statistically representative survey of opinion. This document descriptively reports all substantive points made by UK Sport's stakeholders over the course of the consultation. The aim is to present a neutral, thematic overview of the range of viewpoints expressed. Many points were raised repeatedly by different stakeholders, so, where possible, the most detailed and coherent versions of each argument have been included. Given the high quality of many of the submissions, they have largely been allowed to speak for themselves, with minimal editing used to preserve anonymity, remove ancillary details, and protect other sensitivities.

Methodology

The consultation consisted of two parts. The first was a series of **three deliberative workshops** in Loughborough (11 participants), London (34 participants), and Cardiff (30 participants), involving senior stakeholders from organisations including:

- **Funders / Sponsors** – agencies and bodies which decide, influence or contribute to UK Sport’s key financial income.
- **Funded stakeholders** – Recognised National Governing Bodies of sports in which UK Sport invests to deliver medal winning success.
- **Unfunded stakeholders** – Recognised Olympic and Paralympic sports that are not currently in receipt of performance investment from UK Sport.
- **Landscape partners / delivery partners** – An external agency or body with which UK Sport works in a parallel role.
- **Arms-length decision makers / influencers** – Organisations with which UK Sport does not have day-to-day operational contact, but which impact on its overall objectives.

Alongside the stakeholder workshops, a detailed **written submission** process was opened to both stakeholder organisations and the general public, to encourage feedback on UK Sport’s strategic direction from as many different audiences as possible.

The consultation was promoted extensively to stakeholders and the public through a wide range of channels between 28 October and 15 December 2014. Promotion channels included the media, social media, the UK Sport website, UK Sport events and fora including UK Sport’s World Class Performance Conference), UK Sport’s stakeholder e-bulletins, as well as direct email invitations and communications with sector stakeholders.

The deliberative workshops followed the Market Research Society’s guidelines on deliberative research. The written consultation forms are included in **Appendix 2**.

Defining the stakeholder universe

Throughout this report, respondents have been referred to either as **sector stakeholders** (people working in the sector or whose roles bring them into contact with the sector in a professional capacity) and **public respondents**.

Within the sector stakeholder categorisation, we have attempted where possible to further define stakeholders by their job role, as that relates to the question being answered – for instance, on questions of eligibility to be considered for UK Sport performance investment, stakeholders have been listed as representing “eligible” or “ineligible” sports, where appropriate, based on UK Sport’s current definitions and investment principles.

A distinction that arose during the consultation was that between “individual / small-team sports” and “team sports” – the latter being sports where two teams of three or more players directly interact with each other in the same space, and thus require additional athletes to simulate competition. This distinction has been indicated throughout.

A number of other sector stakeholder definitions are included:

- Bodies representing multiple sports (e.g. Olympic, Paralympic, Commonwealth Games representatives);
- Bodies representing individual athletes across multiple sports;
- Politicians and political groupings;
- Journalists;
- Sports clubs.

The descriptions given in the report are intended to be as detailed as possible without sacrificing anonymity.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A very wide range of viewpoints was submitted, and these are analysed in depth in subsequent chapters. The following summarises typical responses to the key questions (see next chapter):

MEDAL FOCUS: The focus on medals is broadly supported across the stakeholder universe, particularly among **sector stakeholders**. Criticisms of the medal focus represented a minority of responses received, but mainly stemmed from:

- misunderstanding of UK Sport's high performance remit,
- disagreement with the principle of funding high performance sport,
- concerns with the way the medal focus is interpreted in particular cases.

BREADTH: Most stakeholders accept that there is a need for a clear definition of which sports should be considered eligible for UK Sport funding, and that the current rules meet this requirement. Some questions were raised by multiple stakeholders:

- Is UK Sport satisfied with the arguments against funding “culturally important” non-Olympic amateur sports like netball and squash? These arguments are that:
 - culturally important sports are difficult to define objectively;
 - the examples typically given are contested mainly at a Home Nations level, and should therefore be funded by Home Nations Sports Councils;
 - Commonwealth or World Championship medals in these sports are worth less than Olympic medals in other sports.
- Are all disability groups fairly treated under the current system? Are there additional multi-sport events besides the Paralympics that represent the “pinnacle” of achievement for specific disability groups?

DEPTH: Almost all sector stakeholders (and many public respondents) believe there is a “gap” in the current system and that a more “joined up” approach is required. Most stakeholders also accept that a longer term or deeper investment approach would require additional resource or for UK Sport to be given control over resource currently held by other organisations. The following questions were raised:

- Can time horizons be different for different parts of the performance pathway? For example, can separate time horizons be applied to:
 - Medal potential identification?

- Talent identification?
- Individual athlete development?
- Team development?
- Support staff development?
- Structural development in a sport?
- Are there specific instances where the above approach would improve the way funding decisions were made? For example:
 - Team sports?
 - “Emerging” sports?

MEASURES OF SUCCESS: Success is seen to be fundamentally about winning / medalling, but additional factors are widely thought to make some wins / medals / medallists more significant than others:

- Difficulty of winning a medal / strength of competition;
- Diminishing returns of each additional medal per sport (i.e. is first medal in a sport more valuable than fifth or sixth?);
- Additional “non-medal” factors like participation and social impact are considered important by many people, especially members of the public, and, despite its remit, UK Sport is expected to demonstrate how its focus on medal success relates to these factors.

PRIORITISING RESOURCES: The findings in this section are less conclusive:

- Relating back to the opening question, a clear majority of sector stakeholders who responded want UK Sport to continue focusing on medal success.
- Among the public, respondents varied from around half supporting the current focus, with the remainder wanting a more balanced approach to measuring success.
- A very wide range of different proposals were made by respondents, and establishing a majority viewpoint is difficult, but it is clear that a consequence of the consultation has been to enable stakeholders to better understand the constraints UK Sport faces in making funding decisions.

STRATEGIC IMPROVEMENTS: There was agreement among most sector stakeholders and many public respondents that international high performance sport was becoming more

competitive, and that the return on investment would diminish without continued improvement. Some suggestions for protecting against this included:

- Developing a stronger narrative around the social, political and economic benefits of success in high performance sport – in order to protect current levels of funding and make the case for future public and private investment in high performance sport;
- Develop a clear strategy for attracting commercial and private philanthropic sponsorship of high performance sport;
- In line with responses to previous questions, some sector stakeholders felt that UK Sport could develop separate strategic approaches for team sports and Paralympic sports to reflect the different context in which they operate.
- Further work on the long-term care of athletes, pre- and post-competition, around a clear ethical framework was thought by organisations representing athletes to be a key objective.

PRACTICAL IMPROVEMENTS: Many practical improvements were suggested. The key themes were:

- Better communication with sector stakeholders about UK Sport's role, responsibilities and progress, to improve understanding of expectations – particularly among NGBs seeking or attempting to preserve funding;
- Establishing formal vehicles for knowledge and resource sharing, to increase the impact of investment across all sports – without disadvantaging funded sports. Similarly, the idea of a review of processes to minimise duplication and waste was raised;
- Conducting an impact assessment to generate quantitative evidence of the benefits of investment in high performance sport – feeding into the strategic narrative outlined above.
- A scheme (e.g. cash incentives) encouraging successful NGBs to rebalance their budget away from dependence on public funds – allowing more sports to be funded by UK Sport.

Other suggestions included a ring-fenced innovation budget, earlier communication of decision-making timeframes, universities taking on the responsibilities of underdeveloped NGBs, further investment in leadership development, and a longer period for sports to prove progress before having their funding removed.

PARTICIPANT PROFILE

The aim of the consultation was to make the process as accessible as possible to all stakeholder audiences. Stakeholder workshops were held on three dates throughout November and December 2014, and the written (online) consultation was open between 29 October and 10 December 2014. Consequently, a large number of responses were received and these are profiled below.

Throughout the report, a distinction has been made between ‘**sector stakeholders**’ – people working in the sports sector or in a role which brings them into frequent contact with the sports sector – and ‘**members of the public**’, many of whom expressed an affiliation or personal interest in a particular sport, but in a non-official capacity.

Stakeholder workshops

LOUGHBOROUGH	
Date:	14 November 2014
Location:	Loughborough University
Number of participants:	11
Participant profile:	Archery GB British Judo British Paralympic Association British Wheelchair Basketball GB Taekwondo (x 2) Loughborough University SportsCoachUK UK Athletics UK Basketball Youth Sport Trust

LONDON		
Date:	21 November 2014	
Location:	UK Sport	
Number of participants:	34	
Participant profile:	British Athletes Commission British Bobsleigh / Skeleton British Cycling / Para Cycling British Disabled Fencing Association British Equestrian Federation British Fencing British Gymnastics (x 2) British Olympic Association British Shooting (x 2) British Sledge Hockey Association British Swimming British Volleyball (x 2) British Wrestling (x 2) Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)	England Table Tennis Association GB Hockey GB Olympic Football GB Rowing (x 2) Goalball UK (x 2) Loughborough University National Ice Skating Association Pentathlon GB Royal Yachting Association Rugby Football Union Sport and Recreation Alliance Sports Coach UK Table Tennis England Volleyball England

CARDIFF		
Date:	5 December 2014	
Location:	Sport Wales	
Number of participants:	30	
Participant profile:	Athletics Wales Badminton Wales (x 2) Bath University British Biathlon Union British Paralympic Association Canoeing Wales Disability Sport Wales English Cricket Board (ECB) English Institute of Sport Gymnastics Wales Hockey Wales (x 2) International Olympic Committee (IOC) Loughborough University	Olympic Tennis Sailing Wales Scottish Institute of Sport Skiing & Snowboarding Sport Wales (x 4) SRUK Swimming Wales Triathlon Wales Weightlifting Wales Welsh Rugby Union Wheelchair Rugby Wheelchair Tennis

Written submissions

Two principle types of written submission were received:

- Official, formal submissions on behalf of an organisation with an interest in UK Sport’s strategic direction;
- Submissions made by individuals responding in a personal capacity.

Official submissions were received from 55 organisations:

Amateur Athletic Association	England Hockey
All Party Parliamentary Group on Basketball	England Netball
Association of British Athletics Clubs	English Federation of Disability Sport
Badminton England	GB Boccia Federation
Badminton Wales	GB Taekwondo
BaseballSoftballUK	Goalball UK
Basketball Scotland	Lawn Tennis Association (LTA)
Boccia England	London Volleyball Association
Bowls England	Loughborough University
British Athletes Commission (BAC)	Plymouth Raiders
British Basketball League	Scottish Swimming
British Cycling	Scottish Volleyball
British Equestrian Federation	Snowsport England
British Fencing	Snowsport Scotland
British Gliding Association	Sport and Recreation Alliance (SRA)
British Mountaineering Council	Sport Northern Ireland
British Olympic Association (BOA)	Sport Scotland
British Orienteering	Sports Coach UK
British Paralympic Association (BPA)	Table Tennis England
British Rowing	The Football Association (FA)
British Ski and Snowboard	UK Athletics
British Swimming	UK Deaf Sport
British Triathlon	UK Sports Association for People with Learning Difficulties
British Volleyball	Volleyball Wales
British Water Ski and Wakeboard	Wheelchair Dance Sport Association
British Weightlifting	Wheelchair Rugby
British Wrestling	Women in Sport
Commonwealth Games Scotland	

England Golf	
--------------	--

The job titles, roles and responsibilities included:

Job title / role / responsibility	Number of responses
Organisational submission	43
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	19
Performance director / manager	18
Coach	11
Chair / Vice-Chair	7
Commentator / Journalist	7
Athlete	7
Admin staff	6
Board Director or Board Members	4
President or Secretary General	4
Sport scientist	3
Lecturers or academics	3
Member of Parliament / Politician	2
UK Sport staff	2
Chief Operating Officer (COO)	2
Consultant	1
National Selector	1

Public responses

A number of personal responses indicated an explicit or strongly implied affiliation towards a particular sport. These are outlined below. Campaigns to generate high response rates were coordinated by GB Rowing and GB Basketball, which accounted for 27% and 18% respectively of all responses.

Responses from affiliated / interested individuals			
Rowing	205	Canoeing	5
Basketball	139	Squash	4
Athletics	60	Kayaking	4
Cycling	60	Snowboarding	3
Football	45	Modern pentathlon	3
Swimming	34	Wheelchair basketball	2
Water polo	31	Windsurfing	2
Rugby	26	Wrestling	2
Handball	20	Curling	2
Cricket	18	Formula One	2
Sailing	18	Softball	2
Triathlon	17	Motorsport	2
Ice hockey	16	Biathlon	2
Golf	14	Boxing	2
Tennis	13	Martial arts (general)	1
Skiing	13	Disability shooting	1
Volleyball	10	Fencing	1
Badminton	8	Floorball	1
Netball	8	Ice skating (speed skating)	1
Hockey	8	American football	1
Equestrian	7	Weightlifting	1
Orienteering	6	Touch rugby	1
Table tennis	6	Judo	1
Shooting	6	Karate	1
Gymnastics	6	Trampolining	1
Archery	5	Baseball	1

Public submissions

Public submissions came from people who were members of the following clubs and organisations:

Abbey Gate College	Dudley MBC	North Staffs & South
Active Devon (CSP)	Dulwich Runners, Veterans	Cheshire Area Basketball
Active Gloucestershire	Athletics Club	Association
All-Aboard Watersports	Dumfries hockey club	Northern Vets Athletics
Bristol	Dumfries running club	Northumbria University
Amateur Rowing	Durham ARC	Norwich Handball Club
Association	Durham University Boat	Nottingham Uni Sport
Anthony Gell School	Club	Notts gymnastics academy
APPG Basketball	Ealing Handball Club	Novocastrians RFC.
Army Rowing Club	EFDS	NSRA
ASA	Efficere Sports International	OneAthlete Ltd
Basingstoke BlueFins	EIS	Oxford Brookes University
Basketball England	energie health and wellness	Oxford University
Basketball League	England Athletics	Paignton Amateur Rowing
BasketBall Scotland	England Basketball	Club
Basketball Wales	England boxing (ABA)	Parkrun
Bath College	England Handball	Performance Pro London
BBL	Association	Peterborough City Rowing
BBU	England Netball	Club
Bedford Thunder	England Touch	Plymouth Raiders
Bedford Town FC Eagles	Eveque Leisure Equipment	Portobello High School
BICTSF – Olympic Trap	Ltd	Basketball
Shooting	Falcon Rowing Club Oxford	Putney Town Rowing Club
Bradford College University	Farnborough Phantoms	Ravenscroft OBFC
Centre	Basketball Club	Reading Rowing Club
Brentford FC Community	Football Association	Rhyl Cycling Club
Sports Trust	GB Deaf Swimming Club	RichardWest
Bristol Flyers Basketball	GB Rowing Supporters Club	RiverView Trust
British Basketball League	GB Wheelchair Basketball	Ross Rowing club
British Biathlon Union	Association	Ruth Eyles Coaching
British Cycling	Glasgow Rowing Club	RYA
British Deaf Football	Glasgow University Boat	Scottish Handball
British Equestrian	Club	Association
Federation	Gloucestershire Deaf	Scottish Rowing
British Gymnastics	Association	Scottish Volleyball

British Handball Association	GoSkyRide	Association
British Masters Athletic Federation	Great Britain Deaf Swimming Club	Sheffield Hallum
British Orienteering Federation	Hants. & Dorset Amateur Rowing Association	Shelley McKay Rowing
British Rowing	Harlow Athletic Club	Sign4sport Ltd
British Ski and Snowboard (BSS)	Hartpury College	Silverfish CSR
British Swimming	Hatfield Swimming Club	South Bucks Comets Basketball Club
British Triathlon	Hatters	South London Harriers
British Volleyball	Heriot Watt University Boat Club	South Wales Basketball Associations
British Wheelchair Basketball	HNTC Ltd	Southampton Solent University
BTC Rowing Club	Hull Hornets Basketball Club	Southend Swifts Basketball Club
BUCS	IC Consulting	Sport Northern Ireland
Burgoyne Middle School	Ice Hockey Annual	Sport Solent
Burton Leander Rowing Club	Ice Hockey UK	St Gerard's School Trust
Business Athlete Ltd	Inverness Rowing Club	St John's College Boat Club Oxford
Cambridge Handball Club	Itchen Imperial Rowing Club	Star Club
Cambridge University Boat Club	Jersey Commonwealth Games Assoc	Stirling Strategy
Canterbury High School	Jesse Boot Community Basketball and Sports Trust.	Stragglers Running Club
Cardiff City Basketball	Kettering school of boxing	Strathclyde Park Rowing Club
Carmel College PE department	Lancaster John O'Gaunt Rowing Club	Swim Ireland
Castle Dore Rowing Club	Lea Rowing Club	The Basketball Foundation
Cavaliers Basketball Club	Leander Rowing Club	ThrillCapital / Thrillpledge
Centre parcs	Leeds Deaf Juniors Football Club	Tideway Scullers School
CGAJ	Leeds Force Basketball	Torbay Tigers Basketball Club
Cheshire county netball	Leicester Riders BC	Tyne United Rowing Club
Chesterfield & District Athletics Club	London Met Basketball League	U.C.L
Churchend School	London Volleyball Association	UK Athletics
City Infant School	London Youth Rowing	UK Deaf Athletics
City of Bath College	Lymington Amateur Rowing Club	UK Deaf Sport
City of Bristol Rowing Club		UK Ice Hockey
City of Edinburgh Basketball Club		UK Sport
City of Manchester Water		Ultimatecoach Ltd
		Ulverston ASC
		United Learning

Polo Club City of Sheffield Hatters Congleton basketball club Crystal Palace Sports Partnership Cumbria DeafVision Deaf athletics Deaf Badminton Deaf Sail UK Derby Trailblazers Basketball Derbyshire basketball Derwent RC Disability Shooting Disability Sport Disabled Snowsports UK	Maidstone Invicta Rowing Club Manchester City Council Masterclass ski school MUBC National Deaf Children's Society (NDCS) Nationals Basketball team (Dundee) New College Leicester Newark basketball Newcastle Eagles Basketball and Eagles Community Foundation Newcastle East Griffins Basketball Club NHS Lothian	University of Bristol University of Cambridge Upper Thames Rowing Club VERSEC Limited Volleyball England Warrington Rowing Club Warrington wolves handball team Wensum Sports Centre (Norwich) Winchester Sport Art and Leisure Trust York Vikings Basketball Club
---	--	---

CONFIDENTIAL

KEY QUESTIONS

Overview

The consultation, while giving respondents space to share views on every aspect of UK Sport's work, was centred on six key questions. The purpose of these questions was to examine not just what the overall strategic investment policy should focus upon, but critically, examine the detailed implications of any prospective changes, and explore other factors or measures which the organisation could take account of. A summarised version of each question follows:

1. Should UK Sport's investment policy continue to focus primarily on medal success?
2. Should UK Sport continue to consider investing solely in sports on the Olympic and Paralympic programme?
3. Should UK Sport deepen its investment beyond its current eight year pathway?
4. What additional measures of success exist in high performance sport, besides medals and medallists?
5. In the context of UK Sport's finite resources, how should it prioritise its investments post-Rio?
6. Are there any additional strategic or practical changes UK Sport can make to build on its success?

The full versions of the written submission form and workshop discussion guide are reproduced in **Appendix 2** and **Appendix 3** respectively, showing how these questions were posed in each case.

Subsequent chapters report the response to each of these questions in detail, drawing upon both the stakeholder workshops and the wider written consultation. The full questions are shown below:

1. The focus on medals

UK Sport's current investment strategy focuses on medal success.

QUESTION: Respondents were asked whether the primary focus of UK Sport's investment policy should continue to be delivering medal success as the outcome.

2. Breadth of remit

Currently, only those sports on the Olympic and Paralympic programme are eligible for **consideration** for UK Sport performance investment.

QUESTION: Respondents were asked whether the investment approach should continue to focus solely on Olympic and Paralympic sports, or be broadened to include other UK-level sports or disciplines. If they thought it should be broadened, they were asked what might be included and the reasons for inclusion.

3. Longer term / deeper investment

Under UK Sport's current investment approach, the organisation only invests in sports and athletes who can demonstrate a realistic chance of medal success in either the next, or the following Paralympics or Olympics i.e. **within the next eight years**. Home Nation Sports Council partners also invest Public and National Lottery money to support sports and athletes at community and development levels.

QUESTION: Respondents were asked whether UK Sport should consider investing in or supporting sports or athletes who are further down the performance pathway, i.e. those who are more than eight years away from winning a medal. If so, they were asked on what basis this investment or support could be provided.

4. Additional measures of success

UK Sport currently measures its impact and success primarily by the numbers of medals that Great Britain wins at Olympic and Paralympic Games, and the numbers of British medallists who are subsequently created.

QUESTION: Respondents were asked what factors, besides medals and medallists, can or do demonstrate “success” in high performance sport, and how they would like to see UK Sport incorporate these into its strategy.

5. Prioritising finite investments

In the current four-year investment cycle, UK Sport is investing a total of £380m of National Lottery and Exchequer income directly in 45 Summer and Winter, Olympic and Paralympic sports.

QUESTION: Respondents were asked, in the context of finite resources, how UK Sport should prioritise these investments, and what should be the top investment priority post-Rio 2016.

6. Further improvements

QUESTION: Respondents were asked to suggest further **strategic improvements** and **practical improvements** which UK Sport could make to improve its investment approach in high performance sport.

QUESTION 1 – THE FOCUS ON MEDALS

IMPORTANT: The weight of opinion outlined in this report is not necessarily representative of wider sector or public opinion. The sample was partially “self-selecting”, and some organisations organised campaigns to encourage their supporters and affiliates to respond.

Summary

Respondents were asked whether the primary focus of UK Sport’s investment policy should continue to be delivering medal success as the outcome.

- A clear majority of sector stakeholders (sports organisations, NGBs, and informed independent commentators) felt that the current focus on medals should continue, although some expressed concerns about how this principle was being interpreted.
- A significant minority of sector stakeholders felt that the focus on medals should not continue or should be balanced by other factors. These are outlined in detail in subsequent chapters.
- Disagreement was more prevalent among responses received from the general public (roughly a 50/50 split across the public responses), although not all public respondents demonstrated an understanding of the question’s context – in particular, that UK Sport’s remit is to invest in high-performance sports, and that other governmental bodies exist with a community sport remit.
- A number of sector stakeholders felt that the binary (yes/no) format of the question itself was too simplistic and that the issue was more nuanced than the question implies. These more nuanced perspectives are addressed in further detail in the subsequent chapters of this report.
- Most respondents, looking at the issue from a wide range of different perspectives emphasised that UK Sport had set a simple goal and consistently achieved that goal, and that, in the main, this approach should be continued. Many apparently critical voices were, on closer inspection, arguing for

modifications to the interpretation of UK Sport’s investment principles, rather than a complete overhaul.

MEDAL FOCUS AT A GLANCE...			
Response	Sector stakeholders	Public responses	Notes
Yes – unequivocal	72%*	46%*	Unequivocally in favour of current approach.
Mixed views	14%*	24%*	Argued that medals were a key goal, but were concerned about the ‘no compromise’ interpretation excluding other important factors.
No – wider participation and grassroots	10%*	20%*	Argued that investment in youth, grassroots development and mass participation should be the objective.
No – philosophical	2%*	7%*	Believed any focus on competitive outcomes incompatible with public funding.
No – other / unclear	2%*	3%*	Response did not fall into above categories.
	<i>Base: 167</i>	<i>Base: 757</i>	
<p>IMPORTANT: Percentages are indicative only of <u>written</u> responses received (either formally, on behalf of an organisation, or personal submission). They do not reflect views or opinions from the stakeholder workshops, and do not indicate strength of support among the wider stakeholder population or among the general population.</p>			

1.1. Arguments in favour of current approach

1.1.1. High performance success is defined in medals

A clear majority of sector stakeholders (sports organisations, NGBs, and informed independent commentators) and around half of all public respondents felt that the current focus on medals should continue, as this defines “success” in high performance sports:

“If medal success is the key KPI then your success in delivering it has been outstanding, if government mess about with your remit then that’s a different story.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“If success isn’t about medals, then what is it? All the other definitions are either things that contribute to success or outcomes of success – or other things that might be good in their own right, but don’t to me constitute success. Success is medals.”

(Higher Education Institution)

“I believe that all sports’ primary strategy should be medal success. There are a number of other organisations ([Home Nations Sports Councils], Local council[s] etc.) who have participation as a key driver and I feel [medal success] needs to be kept at the top of someone’s agenda. If medal success is not the primary focus I fear that the level within British sport will drop. People match expectation and work ethic with targets and by having medals as the primary focus it keeps athletes and governing bodies aspiring for this and pushing performance. Without it we could have a 'settle for' not good enough.”

(Coach affiliated to funded individual / small-team sport)

1.1.2. Simplicity of objectives / avoiding dilution

Many respondents argued additionally that there was a risk to UK Sport’s current high performance success if additional objectives were introduced.

“If predicting podium was an exact science then that part would be easy but it’s not so you then get into a complex arguments about potential and before you know where you are you have diluted standards. In my experience wannabes will push and push for lower standards to fit what they have got rather than strive for higher.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

1.1.3. Medal success drives success in other areas

Some respondents argued that medal success was the key driver of positive outcomes in other areas, and that it should therefore be the primary objective:

“It is vital to recognise [...] that this wider impact is driven primarily by the success of the team and the medals won by the athletes. The credibility of the

wider message around Paralympians is driven by the world class nature of the competition. Without that there is not the same level of engagement or attraction as non-disabled people are not inspired in the same way. So this wider benefit relates directly to continued investment in medal success.”

(Multi-sport organisation)

1.1.4. Caveated arguments

A number of sector stakeholders felt that the binary (yes/no) format of the question itself was too simplistic and that the issue was much more nuanced than the question implies. These more nuanced perspectives are addressed in further detail in the subsequent chapters of this report, but a typical perspective follows:

“Yes [objective should remain medal success]. [We acknowledge] that the current system is working well and world leading but, in order for it to maintain these high standards going forward, it is critical that we check and challenge this system and refine where possible. A focused, no-compromise approach allows investment in NGB systems and structures and, in turn, breeds a sustainable longer term success.

For those sports who [sic] are not currently funded and/or not currently capable of delivering medal success in the near future, a separate support network is required. This may not necessarily be the remit of UK Sport but needs to be addressed in the UK sporting system in some form. There is a gap between the funded and non-funded sports which is becoming increasingly difficult to bridge. Further support is required for non-funded sports to ensure that they are able to put the appropriate systems in place to ensure that, over time, they are eligible for funding. This may need to be a multi-tiered approach so that sports need to reach certain milestones before progressing to the next level of support before, ultimately being able to prove that they can deliver medal success and be eligible for funding.

[We believe] that further analysis is required on whether the number of medals available per sport should also be taken into account when allocating funding (e.g. in team sports where only two medals are available). In that vein, [we] also believe that there is value in investigating whether there should be separate

funding criteria and principles for team sports, which would take into account factors such as impact on community and participation levels in addition to the performance criteria already used by UK Sport.”

(Multi-sport organisation)

1.2. Arguments against current approach

1.2.1. Medal success cannot be the “be all and end all”

Many respondents – particularly those affiliated to sports which have evidently struggled to demonstrate medal potential to UK Sport – argued that additional factors should be considered. These arguments are outlined in much more detail in subsequent chapters, but the following responses were typical:

“As UK Sport funding is public money, [we believe] along with medal success, the consequences of UK Sport’s allocation strategy must also address four key checks:

- Who benefits?
- Is it equitable?
- Does it entrench privilege?
- Are the sports relevant to UK citizens?

Whilst reaching the top of the medal league tables should be celebrated, it is not clear from the APPG’s perspective that our final position in the table is inspirational to all sections of society; we do believe the performances of athletes taking part at the highest level and achieving success can be just as inspiring, provided it is relevant and reflects society as a whole, rather than certain sections.”

(Political grouping representing unfunded team sport)

“While winning medals is important, it should contribute to the wider good of society, including increase participation and developing inclusion. The current system does not factor in any other factors into decision making, so the wider impact of a sport is not considered.

Additional factors may include:

- The accessibility of the sport to all sections of society (opportunities to participate and cost of participation)
- The ability of the sport to engage and inspire young people
- The ability of the sport to reach BME groups”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

“It should be the key outcome, yes, as that improves the effectiveness of the funding but it should not be exclusively so and especially not exclusively “gold” in Paralympic sports.

There is a need to use UK Sport’s influence in maximising medal success to engage with the wider public interest in sport – fitting in with other government agendas such as health and education as well as sport. This is because of the profile performance sport creates in the community and communities e.g. women in netball, urban youth and basketball. UKS should look to the future and invest in elite performance in the profile sports of tomorrow especially those that could be future Olympic / Paralympic sports participated in by younger generations.”

(Body representing athletes)

1.2.2. Re-interpreting ‘medal success’

Most critical voices ultimately argued that they were not against “medal success” per se, but the way this goal and the pathways towards it were interpreted by UK Sport and the wider system. These criticisms are outlined throughout subsequent sections of this report. Some typical responses are summarised below:

“Yes, but with a long-term view. Sports that are still relatively unknown in the UK can be growing at a very quick rate. Take basketball as an example. It is currently one of the biggest sports amongst teenagers, yet the national team are not currently performing. To get the results, funding must be given to encourage people to stay in the sport and to get the next generation of basketball players to start training and competing at a higher standard.”

(Journalist)

“Yes, but I would favour a slightly less rigid approach.”

(Member of Parliament)

“Sport should challenge itself further and seek to win medals in a wider variety of sports at Olympic and Paralympic level. In doing this it must take in to account a greater measure of the success in each of these other sports, which frequently are ‘more difficult’ to achieve medals in and the length of time each sport needs to develop medal winning athletes. This will allow UKS to have a broader impact on the community, health and other social benefits by investing in and supporting elite pathways in these other sports.”

(Unfunded individual / small-team sport NGB)

1.2.3. The principle of focusing on ‘high performance’ is wrong

Among the public respondents critical of the medal focus (just under 50% of the sample), the most common criticism of the medal focus was philosophical – that sport ought to mean more than just medal or trophy success. This viewpoint was also held by a minority of stakeholders working in the sector.

“There is more to sport than just medals.”

(Member of the public)

“Should focus on grassroots and making sport fun.”

(Member of the public)

“The benefits of taking part in sport are well documented. Focusing on medals does not encourage everyone to take part in sport.”

(Member of the public)

“[It makes] NGBs focus on the elite and [...] not grow sport from the grass roots upwards.”

(Association of sports clubs)

In the stakeholder workshops, respondents were asked to critique this argument, and most stated that these viewpoints (while valid) would require a wholesale reappraisal of UK Sport's remit vis-à-vis Home Nations Sports Councils and other sports / recreational organisations in the UK. It was argued in mitigation that the name "UK Sport" itself does not signpost to less engaged stakeholders that the organisation's remit is focused purely on high performance sport.

Conclusions

Most respondents emphasised that this consultation should not undermine the achievements of UK Sport in delivering medal success across a wide range of Olympic and Paralympic sports. Besides fundamental disagreements with publicly funded high performance sport (beyond the scope of this report), most criticisms raised concerns about how objective the concept of 'medal success' could be, and therefore probed how differing interpretations might affect outcomes in different situations. These are all assessed in depth in the subsequent chapters of this report.

QUESTION 2 – BREADTH OF REMIT

IMPORTANT: The weight of opinion outlined in this report is not necessarily representative of wider sector or public opinion. The sample was partially “self-selecting”, and some organisations organised campaigns to encourage their supporters and affiliates to respond.

Summary

Respondents were asked whether the investment approach should continue to focus solely on Olympic and Paralympic sports, or be broadened to include other UK-level sports or disciplines. If they thought it should be broadened, they were asked what might be included and the reasons for inclusion.

- Overall, it was felt by the overwhelming majority of sector stakeholders and public respondents that the current focus was broadly right, with a substantial minority arguing that some exceptions could be made.
- Most stakeholders with a working knowledge of the sector argued that a single event (or series of events) needed to be used as a common benchmark, and that the Olympic and Paralympic Games were the most prestigious events of their kind.
- Some argued that sports of cultural importance (particularly squash and netball) ought to be included, although it was countered by others that this would raise questions of Home Nations versus UK-wide funding, as England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland typically compete separately in these sports.
- It was argued that, given the unique impact of disability sport, the scope of UK Sport’s disability sport investment beyond the Paralympics could be reconsidered. Many disabilities (e.g. deafness, learning disabilities) are not included in the Paralympics, but severely impair athletic performance in many sports.

Please note: Some responses (mainly from public respondents) focused on which Olympic and Paralympic sports should *receive* funding (rather than be eligible for

consideration for investment); likewise, some responses focused on non-Olympic / Paralympic milestones in sports currently eligible for consideration for funding; these points are covered in the sections ‘Defining Success’ and ‘Prioritising Finite Resources’. Wherever possible, all substantive points relevant to the question have been summarised, particularly where they have been presented as general criteria which can inform decision-making across multiple sports (as opposed to specific arguments in favour of a particular sport).

The key summary of responses is shown below:

BREADTH AT A GLANCE...			
Response	Sector stakeholders	Public responses	Notes
Continue with current approach	68%*	65%*	
Broaden to additional sports	29%*	20%*	The following additional sports were mentioned multiple times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Netball (11% sector / 4% public) • Squash (8% sector / 2% public) • Deaf sports (4% sector / 3% public)
Focus on fewer sports	2%*	2%*	Typically excluding Olympic / Paralympic disciplines of professional sports
Other	–	13%*	Many public respondents mentioned already eligible sports like basketball
	<i>Base: 167</i>	<i>Base: 757</i>	
<p>IMPORTANT: Percentages are indicative only of <u>written</u> responses received (either formally, on behalf of an organisation, or personal submission). They do not reflect views or opinions from the stakeholder workshops, and do not indicate strength of support among the wider stakeholder population or among the general population.</p>			

1.3. Arguments in favour of current approach

Among the sector stakeholders participating in the deliberative workshop sessions, an overwhelming majority argued in favour of retaining the current approach. Some possible exceptions were acknowledged, and these are assessed later in this section.

Most stakeholders with an expert working knowledge of the sector presented a version of the following argument:

1. The resources available for investment in high-performance sports are finite, so a threshold for investment must exist;
2. The chosen threshold should be applicable objectively across all sports;
3. A sport's presence in a single multi-sport event or series of events is the fairest objective measure of eligibility;
4. The Olympic and Paralympic Games are the most prestigious multi-sport events in the world – in terms of scale, reach, level of competition, and impact;
5. Therefore representation in the Olympic and Paralympic Games is the most logical criterion for a sport's eligibility for funding.

Examples of this argument follow:

“In an ideal world, UK Sport World Class investment would extend to any medal potential athlete competing in a sport where they represented Great Britain and Northern Ireland at the highest level of competition.

This could potentially extend beyond Olympic and Paralympic sports albeit the clear majority of elite sport outside of the Games is competed for at home country level, making UK investment in those athletes hard to calculate and justify.

So in a world of finite/ diminishing public resources, it is appropriate that UK Sport does limit the scope of its investment to Olympic and Paralympic success.

Given the points about national pride and the positive manifestation of nationhood above, diluting the focus around Paralympic and Olympic success would in turn dilute the ability that success at the Games has to drive public interest and engagement.”

(Landscape partner)

“It is self-evident that the no-compromise approach to elite sport funding cannot be extended to cover non-Olympic and non-Paralympic sport without a dramatic rise in public funding and a considerably more complex set of investment principles (and the accompanying bureaucracy) if a meaningful meritocratic funding process is to be achieved. The former seems unlikely and the latter undesirable.”

(Landscape partner)

“The investment approach should continue to focus solely on Olympic and Paralympic sports. Olympic and Paralympic medals represent the peak of achievement at the highest level of international competition. The Olympic and Paralympic Games represent the world’s biggest sporting stage. Olympic and Paralympic medals are universally recognised as the pinnacle of sporting achievement. Olympic and Paralympic Champions become icons of success and achievement, both in and beyond sport.”

(Eligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Focus[ing] on Olympic and Paralympic sports avoids the dilution of what is already limited funding and helps to preserve the system that delivers identifiable success to the Nation on a repeatable basis. Great Britain and the Team GB brand have significant social and economic value and should be preserved and protected when it comes to Government investment in British sport.”

(Eligible team sport NGB)

“The focus should continue to focus on the Olympic and Paralympic sports as these are the barometer for sporting excellence at the very highest level.”

(Member of the public)

“Primary focus should be Olympic and Paralympic sport as most tend to be of an ‘amateur’ nature, struggling for funding and publicity.”

(Member of the public)

“Keep investing in Olympic and Paralympic sports. There are certainly enough sports in the Olympic and Paralympic Games to cater for everyone.”

(Member of the public)

Additional points made in favour of the current approach include the argument that non-Olympic / Paralympic sports are better covered by other funding channels:

“We think it is logical for UK Sport to fund Olympic/Paralympic sports only as to minimise risk of watering down talent and expertise within one key organisation, however the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) should ensure all sports that fire the imagination of a significant number of young people in the UK in significant numbers, and are physically challenging and engaging, must receive the appropriate levels of support that considers the availability of other resources and relative participation levels.

This support may be provided through Sport England or some other funding vehicle, as determined in a joined up way by DCMS, and UK Sport should be fully engaged and contributing to that strategy.”

(Eligible team sport NGB)

“There has to be a line drawn somewhere and the Olympics / Paralympics is one of the biggest brands in the world with huge media profile so it makes sense to draw the line there. There are other Home Nation based sports that should be (and are) funded by the home country Sports Councils.”

(Eligible team sport NGB)

Developing the argument that the Olympic and Paralympic Games are the pinnacle of sporting achievement, many respondents also emphasise that these Games have a unique power to inspire the British public – often pointing to the example of the London 2012 Olympics:

“The Olympics and Paralympics for the majority of sports remain as the pinnacle of achievement so remain the best measure of success for those sports. In addition, the unrivalled media profile enjoyed by the Olympics and Paralympics mean they deliver the best possible value in terms of inspiring others to get

involved in any sport, value other sporting events will always struggle to match. It is important to note that although the focus is on Olympic and Paralympic success – this stimulates success on an annual basis at World Championship and European Championship level so that inspiration does not just arrive in four-yearly bursts.”

(Eligible individual / small-team sport)

1.4. Arguments in favour of changing remit

Please note: In response to this question, a number of responses (all from members of the public) argued against the principle of funding high-performance sport *per se*. The aim of this question was to identify additional opportunities for UK Sport to support high performance sports beyond Olympic and Paralympic disciplines. These responses have been summarised elsewhere in the report.

1.4.1. Including non-Olympic / Paralympic sports of cultural importance

The most common argument in favour of broadening UK Sport’s remit was that some non-Olympic / Paralympic sports are particularly important to people and communities in some parts of the UK.

“It should not be solely Olympic and Paralympic sports. Many funding bodies include sports which have specific importance to the people of that nation.”

(Eligible team sport NGB)

“The support should be given not just to Olympic Sports but also those sports which are deeply embedded within the British Culture.

UK Sport should invest in those sports which matter to large numbers of UK residents and not simply minority Olympic Sports where medal success is easier.”

(Professional sport NGB)

“Primarily our national sports – and be proud of them (football, hockey, cricket, rowing, sailing, canoeing, netball, etc.). The moment the sport is not an Olympic

sport it becomes condemned to being a second class sport which is wrong. Be proud as a nation and do not be afraid to say no to the [IOC], they are not accountable to British citizens.”

(Member of the public)

It was noted by many stakeholders at all levels that a number of sports currently eligible for funding are “niche”, with no UK tradition of participation, while sports like netball and squash have a long tradition of UK participation (at both high-performance and recreational level).

Several counterarguments were made. These are summarised below:

1. The most common counterargument among sector stakeholders was that the inclusion of non-Olympic / Paralympic sports and disciplines in the funding programme would make it impossible to set an objective benchmark that could apply across all sports.
2. Some workshop participants (a minority) disputed the premise, arguing that these sports were not as significant as Olympic and Paralympic sports. They sometimes argued that (perhaps with the exception of professional sports) a sport’s inclusion in the Olympic or Paralympic Games was the best measure of its importance.
3. Some stakeholders also made the practical observation that the most prominent non-Olympic / Paralympic sports in the UK are typically contested at Home Nation level (i.e. the England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland teams are each competitive at international level). They argued that this made it difficult to justify funding by a UK-wide body, and that Home Nations Sports Councils should retain responsibility for high-performance funding in these sports.

1.4.2. Including all sports with a high standard of performance

Several respondents representing currently ineligible sports argued that UK competitors were demonstrating high-performance capabilities in these sports, and that eligibility should therefore be extended to all sports.

“I believe [UK Sport] [...] should be broaden[ing] their funding portfolio to include non-Olympic and Paralympic sports who can demonstrate they are world class or have the potential to be world class such as [our sport].”

(Ineligible team sport NGB)

“[We] firmly believe that the focus should not be solely on Olympic and Paralympic sports. We believe that there are non-Olympic sports that make a significant contribution to success though we recognise that certain disciplines in multi discipline sports can have a greater scale of impact.

[Our sport was previously supported by UK Sport.] The development of the sport, with the knowledge and professional support provided by UK Sport funding and its partners, grew rapidly and enabled a number of athletes to train full-time and become ‘professional’ within their sport. The knowledge, approach and developmental pathway that came with funding revolutionised the sport at the elite level. [...] The loss of funding was difficult for the athletes as the loss of financial support impacted on their ability to train and compete at the highest level.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Consideration should be given to funding any other sport that has considerable success and can generate a similar uplift in participation if successful. This would of course require extensive television, press and social media coverage of that success.”

(Body representing both eligible and ineligible sports)

“Focus on the Olympics/Paralympics and World Championships where there is a comparable level of competition to the Olympics.”

(Member of the public)

Two counterarguments were made:

1. Benchmarking (against other sports) performance in a sport not included in the Olympic or Paralympic Games is difficult or impossible;

2. In some cases, it can also be difficult to agree what is or is not a “sport”.

In response to the second point, one organisation argued that eligibility for consideration by the IOC could be used as a threshold:

“[Our sport] was shortlisted for the 2020 Olympics. A sport must fulfil certain criteria to make the shortlist. Criteria along similar lines could be an eligibility factor for UK Sport funding.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

1.4.3. Including additional disability sports events

In the arena of disability sport, two organisations argued that the Paralympics exclude a majority of impairment groups, and that UK Sport could look to support other events in this area, which similarly represent the pinnacle of sporting achievement for that disability group:

“Eligibility to compete in the Paralympics is confined to a minority of impairment groups. It has been said that fewer than 20% of disabled people would be eligible to compete in a Paralympic event. Whilst recent progress has seen some athletes with learning disability included in a limited sports programme, deaf athletes are unable to compete in the Paralympics (except where they have another eligible impairment). Some impairment groups are limited in the range of sport within which they can compete.

[We] recognise that eligibility to compete in the Paralympics is a question for discussion with the International Paralympic Committee (IPC), however, our comment would be that while ever the Paralympics provides such a narrow opportunity for disabled people, it should not be the sole recipient of elite sport investment from UK Sport.”

(Multi-sport federation)

“You should also include Deaf Sports within the funding programme as there are many talented athletes that have high medal potential and deaf sports deserve equal funding as the Paralympic programmes.”

(Member of the public)

1.5. Other observations

1.5.1. Alignment with non-Olympic disciplines in Olympic / Paralympic sports

Some Olympic / Paralympic sports are very closely related to ineligible disciplines, and some respondents argued that UK Sport involvement in the ineligible disciplines (where appropriate) could foster success in eligible disciplines.

“The recipient NGB should be allowed flexibility to invest in non-Olympic and Paralympic disciplines if these can be seen to contribute to Olympic & Paralympic success.”

(Eligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

Conclusions

The most consistently agreed argument was that an explicit “rule” should be in place, and that this should be based on an objective measure of sporting validity. The argument that the Olympics and Paralympics represent the pinnacle of amateur sporting achievement passes unchallenged, so most suggested changes are proposed additions to this rubric.

A number of responses sought exceptions or expansions to the current principle of eligibility, and these cases will need to be assessed by UK Sport. The case for expanding the range of disability sports could be argued to be more consistent with UK Sport’s current strategy, in that advocates asserted that the Deaflympics and Special Olympics run parallel to the Paralympics, as the most prestigious multi-sport events among their respective disability groups. This contrasts with the arguments for expansion in able-bodied sport, where the Commonwealth Games and individual sports’ World Championships are seen by most stakeholders as being less prestigious events than the Olympics.

QUESTION 3 – LONGER TERM / DEEPER INVESTMENT

IMPORTANT: The weight of opinion outlined in this report is not necessarily representative of wider sector or public opinion. The sample was partially “self-selecting”, and some organisations organised campaigns to encourage their supporters and affiliates to respond.

Summary

Respondents were asked whether UK Sport should consider investing in or supporting sports or athletes who are further down the performance pathway, i.e. those who are more than eight years away from winning a medal. If so, they were asked on what basis this investment or support could be provided.

- The key point made in favour of the current approach was that it avoided any “dilution” of funds, and therefore of impact.
- The key point made in favour of funding beyond eight years was that it prevented slippage – either through athletes dropping out of the system, or team sports being unable to build on intermediate milestones. If affordable, a twelve-year outlook was the preferred option for sector stakeholders with a performance focus.
- Many respondents acknowledged that identifying potential medallists over eight years beforehand was difficult, and that support could therefore come in the form of technical support and information for sports to help them bring athletes seamlessly onto the eight-year pathway
- Indeed, it was argued that time horizons ought to differ according to which element of the pathway (individual athlete success, team success, organisational development) was being assessed. A more “joined up” approach with other agencies was widely thought to be the most important and realistic way of supporting long-term medal success.

The key summary of responses is shown below:

DEPTH AT A GLANCE...			
Response	Sector stakeholders	Public responses	Notes
Continue with current approach	52%*	40%*	Although a majority of sector stakeholders favoured continuity, they typically expressed openness to a longer term outlook should additional resource or collaboration be possible.
Deeper investment	21%*	39%*	Team sports were mentioned in this context by 11% of both sector stakeholder and public respondents.
Mixed response	27%*	11%*	As outlined below, a significant number of sector stakeholders emphasised a nuanced approach to depth of investment.
	<i>Base: 167</i>	<i>Base: 757</i>	
<p>IMPORTANT: Percentages are indicative only of <u>written</u> responses received (either formally, on behalf of an organisation, or personal submission). They do not reflect views or opinions from the stakeholder workshops, and do not indicate strength of support among the wider stakeholder population or among the general population.</p>			

3.1. Arguments in favour of current 8-year approach

Respondents in favour of the current approach tend to emphasise that two Olympic cycles is the most realistic timeframe within which to identify probable medallists in most sports, and avoids diluting resources.

“It is difficult to predict medal success further than eight years out from an Olympic Games so, in general, [we] consider this to be a realistic timeframe. That said [...] there may be a tiered approach required to support those sports where medal success is not achievable within eight years (with clear KPIs for those who do not currently receive funding). A degree of flexibility and pragmatism in this approach needs to be applied in some instances.”

(National multi-sport association)

“UK Sport should not invest directly into [...] sports or athletes [further down the performance pathway]. Some will argue that it takes longer than eight years to develop a world-leading system to support elite development, but this has to be a lower priority than medal success in the next two Olympic cycles. Instead, these sports can benefit in turn from the shared technical expertise focussed primarily on the funded sports.”

(Body representing coaching staff)

“UK Sport funding should remain around ‘named’ individuals who have the potential to achieve podium success within 8 years. Winning medals is about putting exceptional support around exceptional individuals. If a sport cannot demonstrate it has exceptional individuals and a credible plan to win then the focus should be on building a high performance pathway and system, with investment from the home country sports councils, to produce exceptional people for UK Sport to invest in in the future.

In order to progress this a holistic view of the sporting landscape is required across UK Sport and all the home country sports councils to ensure optimisation of the performance pathway – as opposed to debating who funds which element. A discussion around whether UK Sport should go further down the pathway cannot be taken in isolation to a review of the home country talent pathways and investment.

As far as UK Sport’s model is concerned, predicting medal potential over two Olympic cycles, as required by the current investment policy, takes performance assessment to its limit as the factors which affect success become substantially more difficult to manage beyond that. Funding for medal potential over three or more Olympic cycles significantly increases the risk that public money will be used to fund failure by supporting athletes who will never deliver success. It is our view that funding to stimulate elite success over the longer term should be delivered with the aim of growing the base of the pyramid of a sport, not to sustain a sports team in an environment in which it is struggling to credibly compete.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“We believe that the current focus and timeline for success assists in providing support at the right level for the available resources. Extending the reach of this support could simply result in “watering down” the level of resource required at the elite level.”

(Unfunded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“I’m sceptical about extending the eight-year window as I’m not sure whether it’s possible to measure the true medal potential of a sport in 12 years’ time. If it is, I’d possibly consider it. Certainly, not beyond 12 years.”

(Sports journalist)

“A lot can change in 8 years and I think there is good support for community and development level sport. Spread investment across more sports and disciplines, but not deeper over a longer timescale.”

(Member of the public)

“8 years seems a sensible time frame to fund athletes.”

(Member of the public)

3.2. Changes to current approach

3.2.1. A more ‘joined up’ approach

Among sector stakeholders, the most widely requested change to the current approach was better integration (“joining up”) of the different sections of the pathway to improve seamless movement between them and avoid loss of talent and resources.

Some see this as a question of better coordination and communication:

“UK Sport should work more closely with other sports councils in alignment of resources rather than ‘take on’ more per se. UKS targets support downwards towards Performance Foundation level while sports councils direct investment upward towards Podium Potential. UKS has a greater chance of sustaining success if it leads greater focus on the layer of athletes below the podium potential. This will require some investment within the home countries as this is

where many of these athletes will reside. Finding a mechanism to ensure quality coaching and appropriate services to these athletes will be important. There will need to be a level of NGB direction into each of the home countries.”

(Home Nation Sports Council)

“It is important to think about UK Sport investment in the context of what is happening in the Home Nations, particularly when different approaches are taken by different Sports Councils. Whilst we need to recognise the reality of devolution in this respect, we also need to make sure that there is alignment to avoid duplication or confusion about who is funding what.”

(National organisation representing sports and athletes at all levels)

“UK Sport investment should be prioritised, as now, within the 8 year timescale for athletes.

However, there is a strong need for investment in a system for Performance Foundation to lay the basis for individuals to progress onto the Performance Pathway. This would be a ‘deeper investment’. At present this is fragmented and a coherent strategy for investment across Home Nation Sports Councils and UK Sport should be a priority, with UK Sport playing a key role.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“With a two-pronged yet more aligned approach between [Sport England and UK Sport], the investment framework would be more effective in supporting and sustaining a sport’s pathway as a whole (thus developing athletes who are more than 8 years away from medal success).”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“The prime issue is that there needs to be a continuum of funding for talented athletes from when they first seriously encounter a sport through to potential world class level. This must be systematic, with National Governing Bodies at the heart of its delivery, and key agencies involved in providing the resources and strategy to deliver it.

A key outcome of this consultation therefore should be the acknowledgement that there needs to be better alignment of UK Sport's eight year strategy with activity below that level to identify, confirm and develop talented athletes to a world class level. If this is to be UK Sport's responsibility then more resource would need to be allocated by the Government to ensure it was commensurate with the strategy.

This could be done through agreement with the Home Country Sport Councils to extend the investment through to 12 years (three cycles) – a not dissimilar approach to that taken in 2005 by the Government who transferred responsibility from (primarily) Sport England to UK Sport to allow for investment to extend from four to eight years. It could be argued that this move, every bit as much as the additional £300m invested, consolidated world class funding behind the ultimate success of top three medal table finishes at both the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Alternatively there needs to be explicit understanding within the Home Countries and especially within their Sports Institute networks of their responsibility for this element of the athlete pathway and their need to align resources and services provided to ensure that sports and athletes just below world class level can continue to develop through to genuine medal potential.”

(National multi-sport association)

Others argue that UK Sport should have more direct control further down the performance pathway:

“We share a widely held view in the high performance sport community that there are a number of major disconnects between the UK Sport funded NGB performance programmes and the athlete development pathways that feed them. Current policy dictates these pathways are the responsibility of Home Country Sports Councils (HCSC's) and are delivered predominantly through traditional club sport and Schools, and Further Higher Education establishments. A future strategy must finally resolve the tensions that result from this, particularly the alignment and uniformity of policy and investment by all of the HCSC's.

The boundary layer between participation and performance sport is often referred to as the talent recruitment and confirmation stage (TRC), and in most sports reflects a period of 1–2 years in an athlete’s career when they are facing up to, and making decisions that have life–shaping implications. At present UK Sport has neither the mandate nor resources to drive policy and the development of best practice in this critical space. Not only do we believe that it should have for the sports it supports, but also that it should be prepared to develop more direct relationships with key partners capable of providing critical support for TRC programmes.

Higher and Further Education establishments with the infrastructure, culture and track record in high performance sport already provide a vital service to elite sport in the UK, and especially in the TRC space. Furthermore, they offer more natural resources capable of supporting the Elite Training Centres needed to sustain UK Sports long–term aspirations than any other sector, and should therefore feature more prominently in future strategies.

Enabling UK Sport to fund and direct strategy for TRC in sports that compete primarily as UK/GBR would enable it to address more appropriately the needs and aspirations of sports such as Basketball without compromising its existing (and largely effective) investment principles.”

(Higher Education Institution)

“There is a funding gap between Sport England and UK Sport. This is qualitative – development cash is for development not elite – and quantitative – the money available is insufficient for elite development. [...] Yes, UK Sport should consider investing in sports further down the pathway. [...] Developing sports cannot jump from nothing to medal success in 4 or 8 years.”

(Member of the public)

“No [do not fund deeper down pathway], but increase co–ordination and partnership with other sports council partners to assist their work at community and development levels.”

(Member of the public)

Many individual sports point to the effect that a lack of integration has on their capacity to identify and develop talent:

“The current investment available is already at full stretch to enable GB to achieve the success it does. It makes complete sense for UK Sport to invest further out but it would need more money to do this. Whilst Home Nation sports councils invest further down the talent chain, the real expertise on talent development sits within UKS so for sports that are funded for talent by UKS and SE for example, it would make sense that the money that SE give to those sports is transferred to UK Sport for them to allocate so there is only one relationship on performance including talent.

In addition it would make sense to increase UKs funding to enable them to fund other sports who could get success longer term. They would definitely need additional funds to do this though as spreading the existing resource more thinly will reduce impact.

Consistency is also really important to the integrity of the sports funding model and the recent decision for SE to fund a GB sport (Basketball) is inconsistent and has created confusion.”

(Funded team sport NGB)

“In our view it is important to consider how different funding streams are complementary to each other, rather than operating in a way which leads to fragmentation of programmes. Therefore we consider it essential that there is better coordination and alignment between UK Sport and Sport England to help NGBs develop talent over a longer term cycle. This will help provide a framework to make the most of the funding available and avoid duplication or confusion of effort. It will also greatly assist in the development of athletes with the potential to move into elite performance programmes and help them successfully make that transition.

We also feel it is important that the talent development pathway is seen as part of the broader sport development structure, to help avoid the potential ‘detachment’ of elite athletes from the rest of the system.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Support should be offered to athletes on a recognised NGB development pathway at the earliest opportunity – with future funding linked to results at all stages.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

“It is admirable that the Government has been willing to countenance funding for two four year cycles since it is not normal to forward plan to this degree. However, it can be seen from our own experience that it has taken well over a decade to develop the necessary cultural changes in our sport and we have more to do. As we have said, our pipeline of [competitors] is not yet sufficiently extensive to ensure we enjoy the necessary sustainability of success. This is made more challenging as we must also secure the [additional essential equipment / resources] we need. We work to [develop this] in Great Britain so that our [competitors] can have the “first choice” ahead of other nations (that are currently far more advanced in this area) and then develop them to World class standards. To do this effectively we need more time; we need a deeper talent pool [...].”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“A more holistic strategic approach across UK Sport, the home nation sports councils, the BOA and the Youth Sports Trust will bring more integration and cohesion to the sporting landscape. Integral to this is the need for closer linkage across the agencies to support, and fund, the talent pathways leading into performance. To be delivered effectively and efficiently these bodies must work more closely together, removing the duplication and potential conflict between the bodies that sporting governing bodies often suffer from. Surely this is a policy decision that is a must for Government.”

(Unfunded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“For all sports it is important there is an integrated athlete performance pathway that facilitates and encourages the development of talent. This pathway should reach from junior talent ID and local sport through to Olympic medals. That

pathway stretches more than 8 years. However [...] the funding of that pathway begins with home nation partners who are closer to the local communities where the elite sporting journey begins.

The risk for performance sport is that the different organisations involved in this journey are subject to different priorities and interpretations of performance sport. Our preference would be for a UK Sport-led performance pathway that stretches further into the home nation pathway to ensure a more consistent approach.

There is a risk within the current structure (UK Sport and the home nations) that gaps can occur in the pathway and that disconnects will occur. This can lead to the mismanagement of athletes and teams. We would recommend a renewed focus on the performance pathway with a more aligned GB led (where appropriate) approach to talent. This could lead to investment in sports and athletes who are further down the talent pathway more than 8 years from winning a medal.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

3.2.2. Adapting to specific challenges faced by team sports

One of the benefits of a more joined-up approach presented by consultees would be to prevent team sports falling into the perceived gaps between UK- and Home Country-level funding, where some suggested they can face additional disadvantages in comparison with individual / small-team sports:

“[A more joined up] approach is especially necessary for team sports, where the ability to target world class investment in a defined way around a small cohort of athletes (thereby consolidating growing a sport’s overall focus on medal success) is more limited. The ‘all or nothing’ approach to current investment in national squads across team sports in both Paralympic and Olympic disciplines is damaging to their long term development and ultimate potential for medal success.

Current performance is poor – since Sydney 2000 ParalympicsGB has won only two medals in team sports. One third of 300 ParalympicsGB athletes in London

2012 were competing in team sports, however they contributed no medals to the overall haul of 120.

The current ability to support and measure progress over a longer period such as 12 years – through sustained investment in the whole squad’s development – is missing, yet it could be argued that the unique dynamics of team sports demand that this approach should be accepted and adopted.”

(National multi-sport association)

“Our view is that it is not credible or possible to estimate which team has medal prospects in 8 years’ time, so the premise is a false one. Such analysis would have precluded Greece winning the 2004 European football championship, or Denmark in 1992 (when they did not even originally qualify but due to international events ended up doing so).

Championship teams are not made necessarily of the very top athletes in their sport at any one time, but a group of athletes, of different talents and abilities, who come together and through collective efforts and good coaching ensure the ‘whole is more than the sum of the parts’. This is due to the essential ‘team dynamic’ rather than ‘individual focus’.

Improvement and change in team sports can occur on a more rapid timescale and in a more unpredictable way, than shaving seconds off an individual’s ability to run, cycle or swim a particular distance.

Teams can also only improve and increase their chances of success if they are competing with the best. A strategy which cuts off all funding and thereby precludes the opportunity to compete has inevitable consequences.

All these factors very strongly suggest the strategy for achieving success in team sports must be different in some fundamental aspects from that adopted for individual sports. We note the Canadian Government has already accepted this rationale for Olympic funding and we recommend UK Sport investigate the distinctive position of team sports and come up with an alternative approach.

We further note the overall team sport outcomes at London 2012 were less than it should have been, suggesting perhaps the UK Sport methodologies for

supporting team sports need some ‘fine tuning’ to reach the full potential our team sports have to offer in respect to medal achievements and social impact.”

(Identical argument presented by All-Party Parliamentary Group and national league representing same unfunded team sport)

“Evidence shows that in some sports, team sports in particular, it takes longer – approximately 12 years – to build a talent pool and to qualify for the Olympics/Paralympics depending on the qualification system etc. The extension of the funding horizon can also help to address the issue of the ‘performance gap’ and ensure stability by helping to retain athletes in the sport. Currently [our sport], as with many other publicly funded sports, often lose young talent when athletes reach 18–19 years of age and fall into a funding gap between Home Nation Sport Councils and UK Sport.”

(Funded team sport NGB)

“[We] broadly agree with UK Sport’s ‘No Compromise’ approach but think it can be particularly tough on team sports [...]. In team sports it takes time to build success at this elite level, and longer than individual sports. Team sport requires not only the simultaneous development of numbers of high-quality performers, but also the blending of those performers into an efficient and effective unit. In light of this complexity, the timeframe over which team sports are permitted to develop their programmes towards Olympic and Paralympic success should be three cycles – and not the two which UK Sport have recently used as the horizon within which success should be achieved in order to qualify for WCPP funding.”

(Professional sport NGB)

“This is one of the key differences between team and individual sports that is not factored into the current system. There is support available, through the Home Countries, to allow high potential athletes to compete internationally and demonstrate they have medal potential in the long term.

For team sports, while the Home Countries are supported to develop athletes, there is a need to compete and play together as a team at high level European and World Competition, in order to improve performance and to demonstrate

future medal potential. Without UKS support, team sports have previously had no support to field British teams to bridge that gap between being competitive on the World Stage and winning medals. When this funding is withdrawn, the opportunity for the team sport to “win back” funding is essentially removed.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

“The lack of funding for developing junior athletes in certain Olympic sports and in particular team sports will no doubt hinder long-term success. How can we inspire and motivate our young athletes towards a career as a professional athlete when their sport has zero funding? We all know that giving youngsters hope, belief and value leads to success and self-belief and hopefully the motivation and desire to win a medal for GB. Without funding of elite junior sport, only rich kids with wealthy parents can access high level training and events and effectively buy their way on to teams thus denying access for talented athletes from poorer backgrounds.”

(Unfunded junior sports team)

“In this instance, greater consideration ought to be given to those sports in which personnel are ever changing rather than individual sports as performance can alter dramatically due to the introduction or loss of an individual or group of athletes. Given the total to be invested there ought to be a way of including funding for team sports which would allow them to develop excellence programmes and give them hope of future development and success.”

(Member of the public)

3.2.3. Funding on development and community programmes

Some respondents argue UK Sport funding of development and community programmes is essential to ensure talent is enabled at the earliest possible stage:

“How early can [talent] identification occur? If it is the responsibility of the individual sport to develop the athlete to the level where this identification can occur then it is important that the individual sport is sufficiently funded to the level that this can occur. The current government policy that the governing body funding should not be used to fund development below the age of 14 means a

whole section of the sport is suffering. If it is intended that this level of competition is funded through the educational programme then it is mitigating against the development of the sport outside the educational system.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport)

“UK Sport should invest in any schemes which will encourage school sport and inter schools (Boroughs) competitions. Scrap the Gove plan which does not ring fence school funding for sport. Ring fence school funds for sport and encourage PE teaching.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport)

“The impacts of Sport England and UK Sport funding are inherently linked: investment in High Performance success influences the strength of the Performance Pathway and grassroots; investment in participation and the lower echelons of the pathway are significant contributing factors to success at High Performance level. Thus, if a sport suffers loss of investment at one end of the spectrum, inevitably, the other end will be negatively impacted.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport)

“Teenage athletes who are deemed as amateur but could possibly be heading for professional level sometimes lose interest and stop competing due to a seemingly more attractive social life. If these individuals are invested in from an early age, possibly given sponsorship and some publicity then they may see the sport in a more attractive light.”

(Member of the public)

“Yes – school level is important to allow access to sports that young people might not otherwise have the opportunity to try.”

(Member of the public)

Countering this argument, others argue that this should remain the role of community sports authorities:

“We do not believe [community and development levels] should be the role of UK Sport. We do not want UK Sport to be diverted away from high performance. We believe it is for the Home Nation Sport Councils to lead in these areas.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport)

3.2.4. UK Sport responsible for entire talent pathway

A small minority of sector stakeholders felt that UK Sport should have full control over the talent pathway from start to finish (even including athletes’ post-competition transition):

“UK Sport should be the agency that is responsible for investing in the whole talent pathway in each sport because:

1. This will allow a focused and joined up approach, removing duplication and conflicting messages and gaps in the system. It will also develop a simpler engagement/success measure for the sports, allowing them to focus on improving the programme rather than working for more than one agency.
2. This will enable a longer term view to be taken over the whole system and enable individual characteristics to be assessed for each sport.
3. It will develop UK sporting expertise over a wider range of sports and far wider within each sport (see above measures)

We acknowledge the complexity of the GB/Home Nations relationships but feel that it should be capable of positive resolution and would enable the best outcome and value for strategic investment in sport.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“I think there is an opportunity here for greater alignment between UKS and SE on the Talent Pathway, if not an argument for UKS to take ‘ownership’ of the Talent Pathway in its entirety across all sports.

We receive Talent funding from Sport England but it is no secret that the funding targets/triggers can be at odds with what we feel makes for a focused and successful Talent Pathway. [It] can be challenging to balance true Talent

Development objectives with a remit of enabling wider participation within the sport.

So you could argue that where an athlete is identified and confirmed as having talent and then is subsequently recruited, they come under a UK Sport backed Pathway programme that is wholly aligned with Podium Potential and Podium.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Consideration should be given for one body responsible for the whole of the Talent Pathway starting at say the target audience of Sports Aid and up to and beyond world class to include transition out of (and maybe back into) sport (as a coach or administrator). That support need not be monetary but could be about access to facilities collaborating with education and health, where possible, and cost effective.”

(Organisation representing individual athletes)

3.2.5. Sports disadvantaged by current approach

Some eligible Olympic / Paralympic sports are so far from success that they are unlikely ever to receive enough funding to enter the eight-year pathway and therefore need support to make this feasible:

“Although there should always be a robust review process that ensures continual improvement, it makes it difficult to achieve success on limited funding that can be withdrawn annually if milestones are not met. This is particularly difficult for smaller sports who may need to radically change cultures and historic strategies that does not happen overnight.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

Similarly, some sports are “late maturation”, meaning promising adult athletes can still be over eight years away from medal success:

“[We believe] there is a case for this in late maturation sports (like [our sport]) where the average age of Olympic medallists is 25+ (and in some events 30+). It is essential that athletes demonstrating medal ability in their late teens can be

supported over a longer term, albeit recognising that identifying future medallists more than 8 years out (Talent ID) is very difficult in many sports [...].”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

Furthermore, it was argued that some Paralympic disciplines have a qualification cycle longer than 8 years:

“Can there be recognition of how long it takes some Paralympic team sports to qualify for a Paralympics and their starting point especially if Europe is the strongest region in the World? This journey could be 8 years and more because of the way an International Governing Body structures its calendar.”

(Funded team sport NGB)

3.2.6. Disadvantaged demographics

Some respondents argued that the current approach disadvantaged specific demographic audiences:

“Evidence shows that gender gap in sport participation appears at around year 4. We believe that investing in a longer-term development pipeline (e.g. 16 years) could help to address some of the barriers that affect girls and achieve the joint aims of increasing future medal prospects (by increasing the overall participant population) and addressing the physical activity crisis which disproportionately impacts girls and women.”

(Body representing women in sport)

“The lack of funding for developing junior athletes in certain Olympic sports and in particular team sports will no doubt hinder long-term success. How can we inspire and motivate our young athletes towards a career as a professional athlete when their sport has zero funding? We all know that giving youngsters hope, belief and value leads to success and self-belief and hopefully the motivation and desire to win a medal for GB. Without funding of elite junior sport, only rich kids with wealthy parents can access high level training and events and effectively buy their way on to teams thus denying access for talented athletes from poorer backgrounds.”

(Unfunded junior sports team)

3.3. Other observations

3.3.1. Defining the pathway more clearly before agreeing changes

The point was raised frequently in the workshops and in some of the written responses that discussions around longer term or “deeper” investment needed to be clearer about which bits of the pathway would get funding. It was consistently argued that individual athlete success could only be predicted 4–8 years away from success, while sports could demonstrate structural progress much further away from an eventual medal:

“Sport, not athletes should be invested on a longer term basis but against quite clear and agreed progression criteria with clear penalty clauses if these agreed criteria are not met. This would be particularly important for team sports.”

(Body organising multi-sport event)

“We believe there remains a lack of clarity and possibly understanding across the Home Nation Sports Councils as to what the term ‘talent’ means and how it should connect/underpin the programmes funded by UK Sport. We wish for this area of the athlete/player pathway to be given increased focus not necessarily in terms of increased investment but prioritised as a critical element to the longer term high performance outcomes of a sport. UK Sport could lead in this area but if not they should be informing investment decisions and providing expertise to advise the ongoing management of individual sports talent investment.”

(Funded individual / team sport NGB)

“There is, perhaps, a need for greater clarity of understanding of all the different aspects of a performance programme, for example, greater recognition of the difference between investment in world class coaches and performance pathways vs. funding a world class athlete.”

(Professional sport NGB)

“We do not support UK Sport investing directly in athletes more than 8 years from podium. The investment into sports and the sporting structure and

infrastructure is slightly more complex. The easy point to make is that there must be close alignment between the Home Countries and UK Sport and between the British GB and the Scottish GB. Whilst an easy point to make the alignment is not always evident.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“If funding is introduced further down the talent pathway this may need to be not solely based on the ‘named athlete’ approach, particularly for new or emerging sports. Investment in the sport itself, so that it has increased capacity in what it can deliver and puts itself on a sustainable footing, has the potential to lead to the identification of future athletes who may not otherwise have been identified.”

(National organisation representing sports and athletes at all levels)

3.3.2. “Seed funding” very fast-growing sports

Some sports may be very fast-growing and early investment now could embed long-term medal success over many Games, with the opportunity cost of delaying investment being very high:

“There are some sports [...] that are growing at a tremendous rate around the world. The UK, therefore, should be looking to be world class in this sport so that as it grows, we will remain a world leader and it can have potentially huge rewards at the end of the road.”

(Sports journalist)

“The integrated strategy must recognise those sports that are growing quickly and where “seed funding” is necessary to put us in a place to compete beyond the current two Olympic / Paralympic quadrennials.

We welcome the consideration of a longer-term approach to funding, particularly for sports which are growing in the UK or are new to the Olympic and Paralympic Games programme.”

(National organisation representing sports and athletes at all levels)

3.3.3. Identifying sports which have shorter or longer pathways to success

It was felt that some work could be done by UK Sport to explore in more detail which sports or types of sport were likely to have shorter or longer pathways, so that future strategic decisions could reflect this:

“This should be on a sport by sport basis. Whilst there is a need to ensure that the system focuses its primary investment on supporting sports that can achieve medal success within the 8 year investment cycle, it should also recognise that for some sports it will take longer than 8 years to achieve podium success. Often it is team sports that would benefit from taking a 12 year view and we need to find ways of better evaluating what sports might benefit from a longer period. UK sport could be creative about providing resources and support that develops performance “systems” and athlete talent recognising that like the stock market, a return on investment might take a little longer.”

(Funded team sport)

3.3.4. Differences between Home Nations

Some of the desire for greater GB-led control of deeper performance pathways (e.g. 12 years out) may be specific to particular regions, and will depend on relationships between individual Home Nations Sports Councils and NGBs. The findings on this point were mixed and will require further exploration.

Conclusions

This question generated a considerable amount of discussion in the stakeholder workshops, breaking into three types of debate. On the one hand, where respondents accepted the premise of the question, there was a clear tension between feasibility and desirability. Assuming no financial restrictions were in place, almost all sector stakeholders would like to see funding extended further down the performance pathway. No performance-related case was made against this, although there was an ethical concern about introducing competitors to high-performance training programmes at too young an age. It was acknowledged, however, that excepting improvements in efficiency, longer term funding would either require additional funds, or existing funds to be spread more thinly.

A second point raised was more nuanced, looking at the extent to which judgments and predictions can be made at different points in time, and how this varies depending on the question asked, and depending on the athletes, teams, sports, and organisations involved.

Many sector stakeholders said that this question could be interpreted in a range of different ways, and that the distinction ought therefore to be made between the identification and funding of potential medallists, and the support of successful, sustainable organisations. For example, an organisation might be judged to be on track for medal success in terms of its governance structures, coaching, facilities, and grassroots participation levels, but without sufficient identifiable medal talent on the pathway. A longer term investment approach would need to explore this conundrum in more depth.

The argument was made that the current system favours sports in which a single athlete or group of athletes can be identified as likely medallists with a relatively high degree of confidence, and that this disadvantages sports where the parameters are more complex – especially team sports.

The final point raised in response to this question was that “gaps” exist currently in the high performance setup, where the responsibilities of UK Sport, Sports Councils and NGBs overlap, and that this is detrimental to development outside the 8-year pathway. This problem is explored in more detail in the final chapter (**6. Further improvements**). As stated above (**3.3.4. Differences between Home Nations**), it will be important to establish, through follow-up conversations (beyond the scope of this study), the extent to which this desire is UK-wide, or confined to particular nations and organisations within the UK.

QUESTION 4 – ADDITIONAL MEASURES OF SUCCESS

IMPORTANT: The weight of opinion outlined in this report is not necessarily representative of wider sector or public opinion. The sample was partially “self-selecting”, and some organisations organised campaigns to encourage their supporters and affiliates to respond.

Summary

Respondents were asked what factors, besides medals and medallists, can or do demonstrate “success” in high performance sport, and how they would like to see UK Sport incorporate these into any investment principles or criteria.

- Many respondents felt that medals and medallists should continue to be the only measures of success in high performance sport.
- It was also argued in the deliberative workshops that many of the additional measures of success proposed (performance in other competitions, progress towards competition or medal success) were interim milestones towards these measures of success.
- However, some argued that measures of the quality of an organisation’s systems and processes could have little bearing on short-term medal success, but would be reflected in longer term sustainability of medal success.
- A significant number of respondents mentioned “medal impact” and “social impact” as additional measures of success, encompassing factors like producing role models, encouraging participation, and fostering development in areas such as health and education.

ADDITIONAL MEASURES AT A GLANCE...			
Response	Sector stakeholders	Public responses	Notes
Popularity / participation	17%*	28%*	A wide range of different measures were put forward. These were the ones that consistently featured in responses across all audiences.
Progress / rankings	13%*	27%*	
Impact	14%*	12%*	
Coaching / structures	12%*	7%*	
	<i>Base: 167</i>	<i>Base: 757</i>	
<p>IMPORTANT: Percentages are indicative only of <u>written</u> responses received (either formally, on behalf of an organisation, or personal submission). They do not reflect views or opinions from the stakeholder workshops, and do not indicate strength of support among the wider stakeholder population or among the general population.</p>			

4.1. Performance measures

4.1.1. No additional measures

Many respondents argued that the only true measures of success in high performance sport were medals and medallists, and that all other measures were milestones on the path to medalling or consequences of medalling.

“The factors that are being considered by UK Sport in their investment review process are considered sufficient.”

(Multi-sport organisation)

“We believe the current objectives agreed and set for Rio aimed at achieving an Olympic and Paralympic outcome require a fully targeted, focussed approach. We do not propose any changes to this Approach as we believe it is 85% in excellent shape.”

(Home Nations Sports Council)

“Olympic and Paralympic medals and medallists should be the only measure of success in high performance sport and the primary focus of UK Sport’s funding policy should remain delivering medal success.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“It is vital to recognise [that] wider impact is driven primarily by the success of the team and the medals won by the athletes. The credibility of the wider message around Paralympians is driven by the world class nature of the competition. Without that there is not the same level of engagement or attraction as non-disabled people are not inspired in the same way. So this wider benefit relates directly to continued investment in medal success.”

(Multi-sport organisation)

Others argued that while other factors might be desirable aspects of high performance success, they could not be objectively measured in the same way as medals and medallists:

“We believe that medals and medallists has to be the basis on which success is ultimately measured. However, we also believe that there is a wider benefit that accrues from medal success in terms of public perception and the ‘feel good’ factor. How this can be used, particularly to inform investment decisions however, is difficult to implement.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Fewer medals, yet improved performances according to a set of subjective criteria will be complex to explain to the public and over time will lead to calls for a renewed focus on medals.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“If predicting podium was an exact science then that part would be easy but it’s not so you then get into a complex arguments about potential and before you know where you are you have diluted standards. In my experience wannabes will push and push for lower standards to fit what they have got rather than strive for higher.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“In my view medals are the ultimate outcome, and suggest that the right processes are in place. I think it would be dangerous to try and measure success

based on other factors as invariably these will be very subjective and open to debate. The number of medals is really the only concrete measure of success.”

(Member of the public)

“Medals are the right criteria as they are an objective measure of achievement.”

(Member of the public)

4.1.2. New medallists in emerging sports more valuable than other medals

Some respondents felt that not all medals were created equal, and that new medallists in new sports were more valuable than additional medallists in already successful sports.

“One fact that should be considered additionally is the positive response of the general public to a British Olympic or Paralympic team competing credibly across a wide range of sports at the Summer and Winter Games. As a nation of sport lovers, we enjoy the depth of competition we are able to show during a multi-sport Games, especially when compared to our international competition. This was particularly important at London 2012 (where as host nation we had the ability to ensure athlete representation in every sport) but remains a factor for future Games in terms of engaging the nation and introducing them to the potential of different sports. So consideration of defined credible performance at the Games could also be a factor.”

(Multi-sport body)

“Currently the UK Sport system is looked on as incredibly successful in a range of sports, predominantly material science, physiology based ones – we should be seeking to challenge this and ‘win’ in a wider range of sports.”

(Unfunded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“A focus on more medals across more sports should be continued with recognition of the importance of the first medal a sport wins and the impact it can have. This is even greater in team sports as there have been so few.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

“Where a sport can demonstrate a robust system and the potential to generate medallists, but where that potential has yet to be realised, a case can be made for investment to enable them to make the jump from potential to actual medal success. This might apply to currently non funded sports or to currently non funded disciplines within funded sports.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“There are virtuous circles and vicious circles, and I think sometimes stopping a sport from slipping into a vicious circle and starting it on a virtuous circle is more important than just giving more and more money to the same sports that always do well.”

(Professional sport NGB)

4.1.3. Progress in sports in which it is harder to medal

An argument was made that progress (e.g. from 10th to 7th in the world) in a highly competitive sport, or one where fewer medals are available, could be equivalent to podium success in a less competitive sport.

“Whilst the key [measure] must continue to be Olympic/ Paralympic success, the investment system should also have a mechanism to recognise and reward sports which continually demonstrate strength and depth in their performance pathways (perhaps by using medal success at different competitions at appropriate levels of the pathway) yet, as a result of the sport being ‘universal,’ the standard of competition worldwide means that it is much more challenging to achieve the same level of success as more marginal sports.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“It is much easier to win medals in certain sports, and in others the dominance of certain nations makes it impossible to win “any time soon”. Without recognising significant progress certain sports can never develop into disciplines that we could win medals in.”

(Member of Parliament)

“Supporting sports towards long term medal potential will require a flexible approach to measuring success. The path of progression towards world class level will be different for different sports and will therefore have different milestones along the way which can be effective measures of progress and success. This will be dependent upon a number of factors.

The system and measures severely disadvantage team sports, a different approach, with measures set against progress towards world class level and medals, is required.

The current system needs to be adjusted to allow team sports to improve their performance so they can achieve international success.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

“The ‘difficulty’ in winning medals [should be taken into account]. For example, [mitigating factors include] Asian dominance, sporting complexity, early specialisation, skill based.”

(Unfunded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Continual improvement through a systematic approach should be measured on a sport by sport basis. There will be minimum standards and improvement rates which require to be demonstrated, with an understanding that improvement is not linear and there may be times when ‘results’ go back the way so that longer and deeper improvements can be made.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Factors demonstrating improvement towards the Olympic medal goal should be taken into account.”

(Unfunded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Not all sports operate at the top end of the world class spectrum but over time have demonstrated that they have improved their position in the world so consideration could be given to sports who have progressed through the world ranking and demonstrate the potential to continue that trajectory.”

(Ineligible team sport NGB)

“Whilst the securing of medals will always be the best demonstration of success, I would suggest that in certain circumstances specific to a sport (and its Olympic qualification process) reference should also be given to world ranking as a gauge of progress being made, both by the athlete and sport.

E.g. A non-medal $\frac{1}{4}$ finalist in the World Championships or a UK Sport funded home Grand Prix, might be a disappointment in terms of not achieving medal success, but with ranking points being key to qualification, that should at least be considered as a gauge of progress, if not necessarily success.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Success should be marked on improved ranking rather than just medals, especially as there is an imbalance in the number of medals available in the various Olympic sports.”

(Youth sports team in unfunded team sport)

4.1.4. The quality of facilities and the coaching setup

Several respondents argued that the quality of facilities and of the coaching setup should be considered measures of success:

“When making funding decisions, UK Sport should consider the availability of facilities in the UK for both elite athletes to train at and future medal winners to get a taste for the sport.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Effective systems and programmes for the education and up-skilling of coaches. These would be judged at a subjective level by those responsible for making the funding decisions.”

(Body representing coaching staff)

“The development of ‘home grown’ coaches at the highest level – a clearly defined coach pathway and evidence of a pipeline of coaches developed by the

system who are successfully coaching at all stages of the athlete/player pathway.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Elite athletes need great coaches, who themselves need access to well-resourced coaching schemes. Success can be measured by the coaching available to athletes, and the coach education available to coaches.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

“The facilities to provide better equipment for training in order that coaching can achieve maximum levels in the quest for medals and Olympic success.”

(Member of the public)

4.2. Non-performance measures

4.2.1. Participation

Many respondents, especially public respondents, felt that participation rates were an indication of a sport’s success in a high-performance context, and should therefore be considered by UK Sport in its decision-making process:

“Strong links should exist between the performance programme in a sport and the programmes to deliver increased participation/membership and commercial activity. Sports funded significantly should be seen to deliver success across a wider spectrum than purely performance.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Whilst growing participation is not UK Sport’s remit, it should be mindful of participation opportunities for future medal winners within the sports it funds.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Increased participation.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

“I think looking at the number of people playing in a sport, and identifying trends in sports would be equally important – [...] the impetus given to sports and the inspiration that these leading teams can give to young people cannot and should not be underestimated.”

(Club competing in unfunded team sport)

“Participation at grassroots level.”

(Member of the public)

4.2.2. Societal impact

The impact on society of funding a sport, or the impact on society of a sport medalling, were felt by many respondents to be clear indicators of success. Many respondents argued that success in some sports has or would have a greater impact on society, and that this should be considered a measure of success:

“The most substantial factor relating to the Paralympic Games is its wider impact on society. Paralympic athletes have the ability to inspire wider change to attitudes and perceptions – demonstrating through their sporting excellence what is possible rather than the more traditional focus on what is not. For disabled people, athletes can embolden them to be more positive about opportunities for them to have a more active life and try new sports. For non-disabled people, the Games offers a direct challenge to traditional perceptions of disability and can lead to major shifts in perspective in non-sporting contexts.

[This is supported by] robust audience research by Channel Four [and] the BBC.”

(Multi-sport body)

“While medals are important, the wider societal impacts should also be considered.

If, for example, the unintended consequences of the current approach [are] that double the numbers of young people who attended public schools, who were already significantly over-represented amongst the GB medals, have achieved

medal success between Sydney (2000 Olympic Games) and London (2012 Olympic Games), there is clearly something unbalanced in the system.

It is clear that all sports are not equal in the way they engage young people within different sections of our society.”

(All-Party Parliamentary Group on unfunded team sport)

“[Excepted] sports should be those with high mass participation in this country, or those which are aligned to a wider social agenda (targeting females, ethnic minorities, etc.).”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“A more holistic approach should be taken when measuring success in performance sport – i.e. wider social impact (e.g. health, legacy created) should be taken into consideration. This is in line with a balanced scorecard approach adopted by the majority of businesses in measuring success i.e. other than only financial factors are taken into account in measuring success.

A balanced scorecard approach would help to re-dress the disadvantage experienced by team sports under the current “no compromise” policy and economics of producing medals that favours individual sports.

Evidence in various research studies suggests that team sports – due to higher participation and involvement – are more effective than individual sports in maximising well-being of society at all levels – individuals, families, communities, the economy and society as a whole.”

(Funded team sport NGB)

“Sport needs to be inclusive and UK Sport may choose to look to broaden the criteria so it does not focus too closely on targeting elitist or narrow interest sports for guaranteed medals but take into account wider points such as participation levels, general impact and national interest, number of medals available and size of competition from other nations.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“We have to look to the social impact agenda and 'value for money', public money, many sports have a reach far greater than the athletes and the playing environments and should not be ignored. [My sport] is a community sport, an all-inclusive sport that engages with all sections of our growing communities and is embraced as an equal playing field. It reaches out to all demographics, all ages and all abilities supporting the participation agenda. It provides real role models, grounded and reachable roles models that can inspire and engage our young people. High performance sport should not be unattainable, an elevated domain that only a few enjoy. High performance sport [should] be tasked with a broader role, a connection with reality and a social responsibility. We all enjoy the mega events and participate in the complete spectator experience but should also be allowed to enjoy greater connectivity through a social impact agenda.”

(Member of the public)

4.2.3. Creation of role models

Related to the previous points, respondents were keen to emphasise that a successful high-performance sport should create role models. This was felt to be particularly important in disability sport, where workshop participants argued that the Paralympics had transformed public attitudes towards people with disabilities:

“Team sports more generally play an important role, not only in terms of delivering medal success and world class performances, but also in providing the role models of the future. Team sports are under-recognised under the current arrangements and [we support] calls for fuller recognition of the fact that a team success should be viewed as multiple medals and achievement, rather than one single success.”

(Body representing sports and athletes at all levels)

“Whether or not an athlete is a positive role model and promotes sport to people of all ages making it appealing for those individuals.”

(Member of the public)

4.2.4. Care and respect for individuals

The extent to which a sport took responsibility for the long-term wellbeing of its competitors and staff was also seen to be a measure of success:

“The degree to which athletes are treated as individuals whilst they are trying to fulfil their potential in performance sport.

How athletes are treated in transition from sport – especially where transition is caused by deselection, injury or illness (including but not limited to mental illness).

Where athletes are retained in sport and play a significant role in developing the next generation, setting the culture in performance sport and / or the governance of the NGBs with a more diverse mix reflective of the various athlete communities.

Where athletes are heard and are treated fairly especially in the creation and understanding of selection / funding policies.

Where athletes are truly represented and listened to in the governance of their sport.”

(Body representing individual athletes)

“[Focus] should be on creat[ing] careers for athletes as well as medals, sustainable ethical careers that allow them to remain in sport for as long as possible – maybe not possible for years to come!”

(Member of the public)

4.2.5. Representation of women

Throughout the consultation, a number of respondents pointed to differences in the challenges faced by men’s and women’s sport. Some argued that a sport’s representation of women should be counted as both a measure and a driver of success:

“We call for all funded NGBs to have a minimum of 30% of women on their Boards, and for business cases for investment to include a commitment to review

working structures and principles to enable gender diversity throughout workforce. Research shows that companies with a higher representation of women in decision making positions perform better than those with more homogenous leadership. A 2007 Catalyst report, found that, on average, Fortune 500 companies with more women on their boards outperformed those with fewer female directors. 30% women on the Board is the minimum required. At companies with this proportion of female board directors, return on equity, sales and invested capital was higher. Similarly, a 2007 McKinsey study showed that companies with three or more women in senior management functions performed better than companies with no women at the top. The companies with gender diversity outperformed their sector in terms of return on equity, operating result and stock price growth.”

(Body representing women in sport)

“Supporting sports that encourage women to participate.”

(Member of the public)

4.2.6. Number of UK-based athletes and support staff

The argument was made that a sport’s commitment to building its success on UK-based athletes and support staff should be considered a measure of success:

“Number of athletes on the programme and winning medals who are produced, living and training in the UK, and the different nations of the UK.

Number of staff on Olympic and Paralympic teams from UK and different parts of the UK.”

(Multi-sport event)

4.2.7. Cost per medal

The argument was also made that the cost of delivering each medal was in itself a measure of success:

“Can we deliver the same/more medals for less investment? In the big winning sports– we should be measuring their success on the least amount of investment required from central funds.”

(Unfunded individual / small-team sport NGB)

4.3. The problem of measurement

Participants were asked to clarify how additional measures of success could be objectively agreed and monitored. There were differences of opinion among respondents, with some arguing that only empirical data such as medals and medallists could be used to measure performance, while others argued that complex factors like social impact could be measured through proxy indicators. In addition, some respondents raised the problem of proving the causal link between a medal and its purported impact in a particular area.

In the workshops, it was generally agreed that beyond medals and medallists, accurate measurement was a difficulty. However, a number of stakeholders felt that more work could be done to assess impact and develop measures in a range of other areas to be tracked over time. This is explored in more detail in the final section (6. Further improvements).

Conclusions

The key measures of success are medals and medallists. A nuanced analysis then looks at how a sport is delivering medal success, and whether it is embedding a sustainable framework for success or merely capitalising on the talent available to it in the short term.

The argument that not all medals are created equal cropped up frequently in workshop discussions, often in the context of social impact, the creation of role models, and so on. Opponents of this position will argue that social impact and role models are impossible to measure.

A distinction between medals that could be objectively implemented is one that weights according to how many other medals a sport has won previously or is set to win. The

argument is that a lone medallist in an otherwise unsuccessful sport is more valuable than an additional medallist in a sport that produces multiple medallists.

Participation, the creation of role models and social impact appear to be key outcomes, given how commonly they were raised by respondents at all levels, but many working in the sector countered that they were underpinned by medal success. Others argued that these factors all fed into each other, creating “virtuous circles” or “vicious circles” depending on how they changed. Proving the causal links in either direction is difficult, and this is an area worthy of further exploration.

CONFIDENTIAL

QUESTION 5 – PRIORITISING FINITE INVESTMENTS

IMPORTANT: The weight of opinion outlined in this report is not necessarily representative of wider sector or public opinion. The sample was partially “self-selecting”, and some organisations organised campaigns to encourage their supporters and affiliates to respond.

Summary

Respondents were asked, in the context of finite resources, how UK Sport should prioritise its investments, and what should be the top investment priority post-Rio 2016.

- The overwhelming majority of respondents felt that UK Sport should continue to follow its current strategy by supporting the sports which do well in Rio 2016 and have proven systems and processes in place. It was felt that changing the fundamental principles of a successful system was an unnecessary risk for the organisation to take.
- Some respondents, following the points raised in the previous section, argued that additional measures of success could be factored into the investment process. It was argued that the current approach may favour “niche” sports where the global standard of competition is lower, as well as individual sports which deliver more medals per athlete than team sports.
- In terms of where funding should be allocated to successful recipients of funding, many felt that UK Sport did a good job of identifying the most appropriate channels of investment for maximising medal success.

5.1. Options in detail

5.1.1. Continue broadly with current approach

Many stakeholders argued that UK Sport should continue to prioritise only genuine medal contenders to avoid dilution of funds, with changes coming only in the form of

technical refinements to current approach (e.g. greater effort to “join up” approach, provision of shared services):

“Medals and medal winning sports should always remain the priority. With reference to the answers provided above, building a more sustainable, joined up system across all NGBs should be the cornerstone of UK Sport’s investment principles.”

(National association representing multiple sports)

“Investment by UK Sport against current resources should be prioritised against supporting genuine Paralympic medal potential within sports over a confirmed eight year pathway – e.g. evidencing medal potential by individuals or teams at this Games or the next.

In an era of finite resource, UK Sport should not be deflected significantly from this primary purpose by demands from sports not in position to qualify athletes or perform credibly at the next two editions of the Games, or indeed by any requirement to fund outside of Paralympic and Olympic disciplines.

Rather, as highlighted in the previous section, resources elsewhere in the system should be better directed and aligned to be targeted at those sports and athletes, to ensure a sustained, continuous pathway for talented athletes to achieve Paralympic or Olympic success or to allow non-Paralympic or Olympic sports to compete and win at the highest level and on the world stage.”

(National association representing multiple sports)

“I think that on the whole the approach has been right, and the medal success shows it has worked. With a little more flexibility we can maintain that success but still give other sports the chance to flourish and have longer term medal ambitions.”

(Member of Parliament)

“[A] complete overhaul of the funding allocation is not necessary nor appropriate and transitions periods will be needed to allow sports to identify areas where they can diversify their income or reduce their costs to offset any drop in

funding. Greater collaborative working between NGBs needs to be encouraged to maximise investment, learning and reduce duplication of costs. This should then free up investment to be priorities to the new ventures where the potential grow in success from potentially limited investment is greatest.”

(Body representing multiple ineligible sports)

“In a climate of potentially limited resources, UK Sport must constantly review its core business focus and, if necessary, concentrate on the winning of medals to the exclusion of other related activities currently within the UK Sport remit. Within that process, UK Sport should constantly seek to maximise the funding reaching the sports by minimising central spend wherever possible.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“The current policy of prioritising sports with the opportunity to multi medal (and a history of doing so) should be continued. As above, a further filter that could be applied might be “relevance” or “popularity” based on British sporting habits and interests.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“UK Sport’s top investment priority should remain focused on delivering Olympic and Paralympic medal success as the key outcome

A focus on medal success demonstrates highest value on the highest achievement and is a proven model for delivering success. UK Sport funding has been responsible for raising Team GB from 36th in the medal table in Atlanta Olympic Games in 1996 to 3rd in the Olympic and Paralympic medal table of London 2012.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“It should remain as support of podium and podium potential athletes and support systems alongside Major Events. Investing elsewhere risks diluting the impact of elite sport funding.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“We recommend maintaining the status quo. We understand the concerns expressed by the leaders of unfunded sports who feel they cannot reasonably make progress so that they may become competitive on the World stage. The harsh truth is that all funded sports have had to prove themselves, as we have, in order to enjoy the privilege of funding. To deviate from the current policy will mean that some sports will not succeed and put the entire system at risk. We also see the challenges that exist for team sports with relatively few medal opportunities and see that it is tough for them. But, it is tough for all sports. No Olympic or Paralympic Games medal is easily won – the policies in place should remain.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Investment should be prioritised on an assessment of potential medal success and financial need. There needs to be a clear recognition of what resource is required to provide core components in support of effective athlete and system development, many of which will be common to all the majority of sports, but also the resource needed to meet requirements which are unique to a particular sport.”

(Funded team sport NGB)

“UK Sport should continue to prioritise those athletes/teams who are GENUINE medal contenders at Olympic/Paralympic and (in our view) Commonwealth Games.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Top priority should continue to be medal success!

I am not aware of any strong drive from UK Sport on efficiency or effectiveness of NGB programmes or in particular “shared services”. There has been a recent “purchasing” initiative but, in the short time that this project appears to have been running, there are no concrete outcomes. We would like to see UK Sport explore investment in the use of a shared services facility for the provision of a variety of the items that all NGBs have to purchase.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“UK Sport should continue to focus on sports that have achieved or are expected to achieve Olympic success. This should include Paralympic events.”

(Member of the public)

“It should continue to support successful Olympic sports [...]. This can then inspire other sports, leading by example.”

(Member of the public)

5.1.2. A ‘Balanced scorecard’ approach

Many respondents, while valuing medals and medallists as the principal indicator of success, felt that a more balanced approach could be adopted in assessing what this meant:

“As more than 50% of UK Sports total investment is currently predicated on future potential (athletes deemed capable of success in up to 8 years’ time) and system development, more emphasis should be placed on metrics that demonstrate success in these areas.

This could be measured by the number of athletes reaching absolute performance standards at key progression stages, or the numbers recruited from the whole sport planning discussed above, and the qualification for tournaments.

The rate of improvement of a team or individual against meaningful international competition is arguably one of the most powerful predictors of future success, and could also be emphasized more.

In short, we advocate the use of a balanced scorecard approach, which reflects both current medal-level capability and long-term developmental metrics.”

(Higher Education Institution)

“Perhaps UKS should have more than one priority. Additional priorities such as developing long term medal potential, supporting sports with national significance, supporting the development of team sports and supporting sports which are accessible to wider society could be factored in to a more rounded and long term approach.

Medal success is important, but should not be the sole priority.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

“Other indicators of success are system focused. Key amongst these are effective leadership at every level of the sport, clear and strong governance, sustainable performance pathways which have the potential to develop world leading athletes, coaches and support practitioners and staff – year on year, cycle on cycle. There is also a need to weigh the effectiveness of the connection between elite performance and the broader development of sport – this must be a strong if elite performance is to be achieved because ultimately participation and grassroots development is the first step in the performance pathway.”

(Funded team sport NGB)

“[A] balanced portfolio approach is possible, with the majority of funds being centred on Olympic and Paralympic medals, but with a broader investment approach to develop a broader engagement with sport, which will engage future champions and society at large, bringing longer term success in medals and a stronger and healthier society.”

(Member of the public)

Similarly, arguments were made that short-term medal success did not always indicate optimal use of funds in a sport, and that funding decisions should also be guided by a commitment to sustainability in medal success:

“Success that is sustainable over a longer timeframe. This would be supported by: improved conversion of numbers of athletes from each layer of the performance system to the next; continued and more targeted sporting workforce development; stronger [and] more self-sufficient NGBs; [the] number of ‘firsts’ in terms of high-performance sport innovation.”

(Home Nation Sports Council)

“The quality and depth of the athlete/player pathway to deliver athletes/players to the podium [could be measured by] international results/performances at

each stage of athlete/player pathway and profile of athletes/players against the rest of the world through each stage of development.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“A holistic view of how athletes are progressing, and providing support to those athletes who are likely to be on the pathway but who are not yet at the level of Olympic/ Paralympic performance. This could show success – skills development and fitness could be considered to be success, which would also help to direct the focus of up and coming athletes. It would also help to retain some of our most talented athletes and continue the success started.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Environments outside of the UK Sport investment that are underpinning and driving talent into the world class system for each sport: Alignment and connectivity for example Home Nation NGBs, High Performance Centres, Clubs, Academies etc... and the numbers of athletes/players/coaches within these environments. Athletes/players who have come through to the World Class Programme.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Another strong measure for success should be a clearly defined pathway from grass roots to elite level sport, with multiple entrance and exit routes to give future talent opportunities to get into the sport and take it in the direction they wish to. [Our sport] has a well-established talent pathway for competition climbing, and receives Sport England funding for talent.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Each funded sport should demonstrate a clear sustainable talent pathway that will lead to continued medal success.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

A commitment to ethical standards and fully representing athlete’s views was also seen as part of the ‘balanced scorecard’:

“Invest only in those NGB's which are transparent and accountable to members. Cut the size of NGB's. Scrap the One stop Plan and get funds straight to the end user.”

(Organisation representing clubs in individual / small-team sport)

“[Increasing] athlete representation. This [should be about] linking that to athlete representation in the governance of the sport(s). In Canada this was only successful when it was made a funding condition of the Canadian NGBs by those distributing funds. There should arguably be better management of the governance of sports and priority seen to be given to the better NGBs and other organisations. [Many difficult cases] come from what are seen to be the “more successful sports”. Medal success shouldn't be a barrier to openness and transparency especially where the mental welfare of athletes is at stake and or potential cases of discrimination arise which pose financial and reputational risks to sport or specific sports.”

(Organisation representing individual athletes)

“Investment decisions should also favour sports that have robust performance systems, talent pathways, governance structures and international influence.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

5.1.3. Return to London 2012 levels

Some stakeholders argued that if all Olympic and Paralympic sports could be given baseline funding for London 2012, then it should be achievable to continue funding all sports in this way, as well as delivering medal success:

“The current functions of UK Sport are published (from Triennial review) as:

- Supporting teams and individuals to compete for the UK or Great Britain at the summer and winter Olympics and Paralympics and equivalent world level events

- Co-ordinating bidding for and staging of major international sporting events in the UK with a focus on Olympic, Paralympic and Commonwealth disciplines
- Maximising the UK's status and influence in international sport
- Ensuring the sports and organisations that receive UK Sport and Sport England funding are well led and governed

The first function has, in reality, been further refined and would more accurately read "Supporting teams and individuals to deliver medals for the UK... etc." Having the talent to compete with credible performance is not sufficient for an individual to access funding from UK Sport.

There is no need for significant changes to these functions except a commitment from UK Sport to ensure that smaller sports and their talented athletes are not disadvantaged and to widen the current focus to support World Class Programmes of all the Olympic sports that make measurable and agreed progress towards the medalling goal.

It is unarguable that the funding strategy and prioritisation in the London 2012 cycle produced medals. The small sports were funded in that cycle. It can be done. In addition to medal success in London, that strategy produced a step-change in the performance structures of all Olympic Sports. The London 2012 formula, or a refinement of that formula could be adopted, ensuring medals and continued progress across all Olympic Sports.

The top investment priority remains medalling. However, lower down the priorities should be widened to include progress towards that medal goal."

(Unfunded small-team / individual sport NGB)

5.1.4. Retain medal focus but rebalance towards Paralympics

Some respondents argued that UK Sport should retain the medal focus, but look at the balance of funds made available for Olympic and Paralympic sports.

“The top priority should be investing for success in the next quadrennial while laying better systemic foundations for sustaining longer term success. Consideration should be given to balancing the relative investment in Olympic and Paralympic sport where significant disparities exist today to the disadvantage of Paralympic sport. Work is required both to accelerate the development of Paralympic athletes who can qualify into World Class Programmes and then to keep them in the programmes for longer. The additional competition, coaching and sports science approaches will need investment in facilities, better data management techniques, travel and people.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Disabled and non-disabled sports have equal parity but disabled sport requires additional relative support (e.g. equipment etc.). Some needs to be set aside for longer term projects [...] but bulk for elite medal winners. We can lose momentum so quickly.”

(Member of the public)

5.1.5. Use secondary factors as “tie breakers”

Many respondents argued that in the event of two sports showing similar medal potential, other factors (like governance, participation, audience, etc.) could be included in any decision:

“The evaluation process should recognise the need to achieve a greater level of stability (for the cycle as the very minimum), to enable programmes to work on long-term strategy as well as short term performance gains. This approach will avoid a knock-on impact at other levels for a sport and will avoid wasting resources.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Where there are sports who are judged as having similar medal potential but there is not funds available to support both, then it would make sense to apply some form of balanced score card methodology that could include the scale of that sport in participation or profile terms and also possible means testing.”

(Funded team sport NGB)

“UK Sport should prioritise funding those sports that are able to generate sustainable medal success whilst delivering increased participation and commercial activity.

UK Sport should fund those sports that are delivering medal success in a sustainable way and to which public funding will have an impact.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

5.1.6. Differentiation between team sports and individual sports

Many respondents felt that separate pools of funding should be made available to team sports and individual sports, as comparing success and medal potential across the two categories was too difficult:

“Individual sports and team sports should be considered separately with consideration given to their respective development and success cycles. 8 years may be appropriate for individual athletes but a longer period may be required for teams. If this should be the case then the role of the Home National Sports Councils and NGBs has to be clarified as there has to be a point where there is a seamless transition from their ‘stewardship’ to that of UK Sport.”

(Local Council)

“[We] also [believe] that consideration of the true value of team sports would be greatly assisted by the adoption of the principle that, instead of a team contributing a single medal to the nation’s tally, the return on investment should be calculated by the number of medallists. Team sports appear expensive for UK Sport to fund, but only because they are deemed to offer a return on investment of just one medal per team. [We believe] this leads to funding of team sports being neglected in favour of those sports which can offer a much more impressive medal to funding ratio.

The value of successful team sports at an elite level is immense. Team sports are responsible for a very high percentage of sports participation among school-age children, account for a significant proportion of the national participation figures

for adults and are strong vehicles for women's and girls' participation. Investment at an elite level within team sports is critical to provide an aspirational tier which serves as an incentive for participants to take up team sports and keep playing. Investment outcomes may well be delivered outside of the performance sphere rather than through large numbers of medals – but will be no less significant for that.”

(Professional team sport NGB)

“Can UK Sport review how team sports are measured on their success? One medal or the number of players in a team? Should there be two priority band tables one for team sports and one for individual sports and resources distributed accordingly?”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

“A more flexible approach, particularly to the team sport agenda, is required. UK Sport could provide support for a significant improvement in a number of team sports through a similar approach but more flexible approach than has been taken to date. It is clear from any national media outlet that team sports are of huge importance in the UK.

For team sports, a different approach is required.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

“Teams need a separate policy.”

(Member of the public)

“Still invest in current high medal prospect sports but take a small percentage off the top to give to team sports.”

(Member of the public)

“UK Sport should still allocate sufficient funding to allow podium sports to continue delivering medals, but a small percentage should be set aside for ‘longer term’ podium sports, and in particular team sports which are able to demonstrate a significant rise in participation rates and solid governance.”

(Member of the public)

5.1.7. Weight up first or early medals in a sport

Some respondents argued that first or early medals in a sport carried more significance than the “diminishing returns” of additional medals in already successful sports:

“If the approach for example was to maintain/increase medal numbers across an increasing number of sports then the investment can and should be spread more widely. For those sports that have been highly successful there could be a question as to the financial need based on the success they have achieved and other sources of income that have followed that success.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“There is a point at which the programmes reach ‘critical mass,’ as with business organisations. Continuing to reward success, without recognising the law of diminishing returns, is not an effective allocation of resources. There should be a mechanism in the funding system to recognise this.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“There should be a fairer distribution of funds ensuring all sports are given the opportunity to fund appropriate representation at future Olympics and Paralympics. It is important that GB can offer a wide range of sports and not just concentrate on traditionally successful sports that may already have substantial funding from other revenues.

As a priority UKS should offer all sports the chance to be successful and a more equal distribution of funds, taking into account well-established sports may well already be well supported by other investors and sponsors.”

(Unfunded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Win medals in a wider range of sports. [The] narrow targeted investment has been successful to date, but needs expanding to incorporate and embrace a wider range of factors. It may be that in the longer term sports that do not require significant investment in technology can deliver on a world level

sustainably and thus these sports should be invested in as well as the sports where we have been successful to date e.g. ones that have benefitted from the expertise in material science and physiology that the UK has excelled in. It may be that these sports with lower technology requirements have a greater relevance to participation and its growth and thus UK Sport should consider a wider picture when making its investments.

[...] Driving greater efficiency from some of the large sports would be useful to allow the smaller sports to be funded, embracing the impact of these sports on a wider socio economic community.”

(Unfunded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Some consideration on the sports own ability to self-fund success should be taken into consideration. Priority should be on previously successful sports but with a block allocated to non-Olympic/Paralympic and emerging sports that have strong participation to podium programmes that allow for the best athletes to progress.”

(Member of the public)

5.1.8. Prioritise investment in sports with social impact

Many respondents, particularly those arguing in favour of currently unfunded team sports, argued that social impact should be considered in any calculations:

“Investments should be targeted at sports that are relevant to the largest numbers of people in the UK, and not to sports that are rarely played due to weather conditions, cost, or lack of suitable facilities which impact significant numbers of people’s enjoyment of particular sports.

For example, if UK weather conditions preclude access to the general public to a particular sport, it makes little sense to send athletes overseas year round, in order to try to ‘bump up’ the medal table once every 4 years. The most ‘accessible’ sports should get the bulk of any funding, albeit with suitably demanding oversight and performance targets.”

(APPG representing unfunded team sport)

“Prioritise funding towards sports that have a greater impact on the social and economic climate of the nation.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“A more holistic measurement of success in performance sport by taking into account wider considerations than just medals – e.g. number of medallists, number of athletes participating in sport, wider social benefits (legacy impact) . This approach should redress the balance of priority from individual sports to team sports with higher impact in terms of social benefits.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

“Priorities should be given to those sports / disciplines with the greatest chance of an increase in future medal potential as well as impact on the social, cultural and gender policies of the UK. Many team sports have the ability to address these issues and are already being demonstrated throughout [our sport] in its versatile nature of multi environment, accessibility, minimal equipment requirements and cost at grass roots level. An ideal sport for schools to adopt to meet social, cultural and gender targets.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

“Invest in those that show potential to succeed and in those that could have long term positive social impacts.”

(Member of the public)

“65% [allocated to] medal hopes; 25% [allocated to] non medal hopes in 7 years; 10% [allocated to] social benefits (other agencies also input money into this stream).”

(Member of the public)

5.1.9. Prioritise sports with widest reputational impact for UK

A small number of respondents talked about the wider benefits to the UK’s reputation overseas, and felt that this should be considered when allocating public funds:

“Consider the potential international influence effect of GB success by accounting for the international reach of sports i.e. nations competing, worldwide participation, national sports in key trading nations, international TV coverage and viewing figures at the Olympic Games.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

5.1.10. Baseline funding for ineligible sports

Those representing ineligible sports argued that the funding requirements for success were typically much lower, and that a relatively small amount of funding ring-fenced for ineligible sports could help drive success:

“We do not dispute that the Olympics and Paralympics are the most obvious priority attracting public attention (outside of the major spectator sports, especially football, which are capable of self-funding).

We understand that the major part of the available funds will be applied to the sports that are capable of success in the Olympics and Paralympics.

However, we suggest that other less well-known sports and/or non-Olympic/Paralympic sports can also be considered and supported at a much lower cost.

Recognising that there will always be fierce competition for the funds, we suggest that a modest portion of the available Exchequer and/or Lottery funds should be ring-fenced for non-Olympic sports and that this could be achieved with minimal, if any, effect on the major funded sports.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

5.1.11. Baseline funding for all Olympic / Paralympic sports

Some argued that there should be a ‘two-tier’ funding system, with NGBs awarded a base level of funding to sustain them, with the remaining proportion of funds allocated on a performance basis:

“Maintain the status quo apart from the 'baseline' top-up funding for non-medal potential sports.”

(Journalist)

“With improved linking of the two organisations, a clearer, tiered system of funding, between the two organisations could be developed for increased stability, sustainability and to ensure there is a ‘quality’ aspect to our aspirations to achieve more medals:

- Top tier: similar to the current UK Sport model, with significant refinements to account for Sport’s place in society and the wider political agenda.
- Tier two: ‘gap’ fund sports which require much longer maturation time at High Performance level, sports which compete solidly at World and Olympic level and require support to continue to reach and impact upon socio-demographic groups.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Priority must continue to be given to Olympic and Paralympic medals, however this should not be the sole priority and account must be given to sports that over time will continue to improve.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Split payment into 2 sections i) High achieving individuals/team sports ii) Finance/support for those individuals and team sports which have demonstrated significant improvement. Advise sorts that as from 2016 ongoing coach development will be an essential factor in determining which sports are prime for support.”

(Member of the public)

Developing this argument, one proposition was that the direct funding of sports could be medal / medallist based, but that all additional UK Sport-funded services should be made available with equal priority to all sports.

“Whilst the investment in sports should be as the meritocratic table, some of the additional services e.g. R&I, talent support, coaching team support etc. should be available with equal priority across all funded sports.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

5.1.12. Some spending earmarked for funding cross-sport initiatives

Embedding long-term efficiency across all sports was felt to be a key goal, and a way of maximising sustainable medal potential:

“In order to build a truly sustainable system beyond Rio the UK must embed its elite programmes in environments best suited to the long-term development of the knowledge and expertise needed to support the 1000’s of hours of deliberate practice necessary for expert performance. The closest parallels in our society are in the military, classical and contemporary performance arts, and Medicine, where excellence has been institutionalized over many decades in an array of Academies and Institutes where young people with the greatest aptitude are able to immerse themselves in an appropriately equipped learning and training environment populated with exceptional trainers and peers.

Higher Education establishments [...] have more of the basic ingredients required for elite sport training than most other domains, and are therefore best placed to offer a cost effective solution to the long-term location of many of our elite sports programmes. UK Sport should therefore prioritise the development of the infrastructure, culture and relationships of a carefully selected group of Universities deemed capable of forging and sustaining long-term partnerships with NGBs and the EIS. Such partnerships would have the added benefit of aligning better the research and innovation capabilities of a national research community second only to the US in global benchmarking, and the potential to improve the undergraduate and post-graduate pathways for the workforce needed to deliver our future generations of successful athletes.”

(Higher Education institution)

5.1.13. Separate funding calculations for men’s and women’s sport

It was argued that exemptions to some funding rules should be considered for women’s sport given the different limitations women’s sport faces:

“Women’s sport should be exempt from the co-funded model (outlined in Investment Principle 8 of the Rio Investment Principles), or should be required to

do so at a far lower investment profile than men's based on wider discrepancies in access to commercial investment for women (only 0.4% of commercial investment)."

(Body representing women's sport)

"We obviously need to support our existing medallist's but some of the money needs to go to sports that promote certain groups in sport i.e. women."

(Member of the public)

5.1.14. 'Parachute' payments to aid transition when funding withdrawn

As a modification to the current approach, one organisation suggested that 'parachute' payments could minimise the risk to individuals involved in a programme which has had its funding withdrawn:

"In the event that funding is withdrawn from a sport, proper consideration should be given to the likelihood that individuals may have made big sacrifices in terms of their career or family to join that programme. If [...] less than three months' notice is provided of the withdrawal of funding, then a "parachute payment" should be made available to support the transition of individuals out of the programme. This would also allow an appropriate period in which to wind down operations while meeting pre-existing commitments (e.g. to enter or host tournaments)."

(Professional sport NGB)

5.2. Other observations

5.2.1. Evidence-based approach

Several stakeholders argued that in order to prioritise finite resources, UK Sport needed to invest more resource in developing an evidence base and a robust system of collecting and tracking data over time:

"We recognise that resources are finite and that UK Sport has a significant challenge in trying to spread the benefits of this investment. We would support

an intelligent investor approach – where decisions are based on firm evidence, are clearly communicated and transparent and where criteria are well understood and set as early as possible. We would also suggest that this investment approach is based on the use of high quality data derived from relevant impact assessments.”

(Body representing sports and athletes at all levels)

5.2.2. Further research into diminishing returns

Several participants in both the workshops and written submissions argued that some of the larger sports were being “over-funded”, i.e. could deliver the same number of medals on a smaller budget, and that the system did not pick up these diminishing returns:

“Turning to deciding relative funding amounts across sports, progress could be shown to Government in UK Sport’s good governance and demonstration of seeking value for money, by UK Sport reviewing and revising their current rigid and formulaic method of allocating funding by athlete numbers, in the light of experience across recent cycles.

Without compromising “no compromise” it might be that the current formula distributes excessive amounts in some areas that could be reallocated across sports demonstrating progress without asking Government for more money and without harming delivery.”

(Unfunded individual / small-team sport NGB)

Conclusions

Given the arguments made by unfunded sports, conclusively settling the debate around diminishing returns with a robust evidence base is a priority, as while those raising this point did not have supporting evidence, it is nonetheless a widely held view.

Of the thirteen different packages of funding prioritisation outlined above, the most consistently argued case in the workshops was that the current system – or a “balanced scorecard” variant of the current system – should be followed. Indeed, many workshop

participants asked for their concern about any move away from the current system to be placed on record.

Among the other proposals outlined above, several would be challenging to deliver against set criteria because of their essentially contested nature – measuring social impact, reputational gain, and calculating the elements of the balanced scorecard are likely to be difficult processes.

One proposal (to retain London 2012 levels of investment to both maximise medal potential and fund all sports to compete) seemed unrealistic, given the finite resources mentioned in the question.

The remaining proposals, whether desirable or not, all appear to be viable, although each would likely have consequences in terms of the UK's medal profile. In the workshops, their advocates typically acknowledged this.

6. FURTHER IMPROVEMENTS

IMPORTANT: The weight of opinion outlined in this report is not necessarily representative of wider sector or public opinion. The sample was partially “self-selecting”, and some organisations organised campaigns to encourage their supporters and affiliates to respond.

Summary

Respondents were asked to suggest further strategic and practical improvements which UK Sport could make to improve its investment approach in high performance sport.

- Many respondents felt that UK Sport could communicate a stronger case (a “narrative”) for the public funding of high performance sport, and that this ought to be a central part of its remit.
- Some argued that this should also be extended to attracting commercial and philanthropic funding of high performance sports to increase the sustainability of all sports.
- Working to achieve a more “joined up” approach to high performance sport, as well as sport more generally was seen as a critical objective.
- UK Sport could do more to clarify its measures, processes and procedures across its stakeholder universe.
- Building and sharing a knowledge base was also seen to be a key priority, enabling the entire stakeholder universe to benefit from the expertise of others in the system.

6.1. Additional strategic observations in detail

6.1.1. No major strategic changes required

Many stakeholders argued throughout the workshop sessions that no major strategic changes were required at UK Sport, and that the organisation was one of the sector’s biggest success stories:

“None beyond retaining what is working now – the model is right, the challenges are tough but we know what we have to do. We want to be pushed to achieve more. We need the firm consistent “no compromise” policy we have enjoyed for a decade. It is clear, uncomplicated and proven. We change it at our peril.

The medal tables tell us that the policy is right.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“[We] support the consultative approach UK Sport has to setting objectives and performance targets for different sports, and would welcome the continuation of this approach.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

But there was also widespread concern that sport was a continually evolving landscape, and the strategies that work now may not always work in the future:

“It is clear that team sports suffer most under UK Sport's model because of the complexity of creating a successful team and the scarcity of available medals. I'd be worried about making non-medal-potential team sports a special case at this time as it would be so expensive as to cost several medals in individual sports. I do think the IOC needs to look very carefully at the Olympic programme and the disproportionate numbers of medals available in different sports. Addressing that would automatically allow UK Sport to reallocate resources but, until that happens, we should maintain, by and large, the status quo. There will come a time, however, where the cost of a medal in a sport such as athletics will become so much greater than the cost of a medal in pentathlon that we may need to consider a more fundamental review of how elite sport is funded. I don't think we're there yet.”

(Journalist)

6.1.2. Drive more “joined up” approach across sport

Many respondents, while favourable towards UK Sport’s current strategic direction, feel the organisation is well placed to drive a more “joined up” approach across sport:

“Although it is recognised that this consultation is being carried out by UK Sport, it is important to consider the UK Sport funding strategy in the context of the wider strategy for sport and take into account other funding streams. Sport operates on a continuum and elite sport funding must not be viewed in isolation. Establishing robust, coherent pathways is as important as getting the right funding settlements within elite sport itself.”

(Body representing range of sports and athletes at all levels)

“The structure of sport in Great Britain continues to be fragmented and disjointed. UK Sport, the Home National Sports Councils and NGBs must be clear about their roles and responsibilities. The County Sports Partnership arrangements across England need to be factored into these arrangements which may challenge traditional ‘county’ arrangements in sport. However there needs to be clarity and consistency.

Continuous improvement is required across the whole of the sector and with the decline in local government involvement due to spending pressures it is probably an opportune time to introduce and progress changes.”

(Local Council)

“There is a need for a greater understanding of how investment in grassroots development impacts and enables the identification and development of world class athletes and teams. I still worry that there is a firewall between grassroots and elite investment. ‘World leading’ organisation is an important term as it in itself recognises that it is the total organisation that needs to be world leading. The system currently recognises this in terms of enablers such as governance but I am not sure it necessarily does in terms of the linkage between grassroots development and elite sport.”

(Funded team sport NGB)

6.1.3. Separately address team sport issues

A recurring theme was the need to address team sport issues – specifically those sports requiring large squads, where competing teams interact directly with each other, doubling the number of athletes needed to train effectively. This definition includes

football, rugby, basketball, hockey, ice hockey, volleyball, handball, water polo, goalball, disability football, sitting volleyball, wheelchair basketball, and wheelchair rugby.

“We believe that UK Sport should form a separate unit to address team sports issues. It is well established, on the basis of key metrics such as the number of players and level of total investment (including commercial and non-commercial), that the home nations, and Great Britain generally, underperform in team sports on the world or European stage compared with other countries across a range of sports, both Olympic and non-Olympic.

Each sport and NGB will have its own expertise and plans to address that underperformance but we believe UK Sport should take leadership in this and encourage research to support the efforts of NGBS, and develop expertise on the essential ingredients for developing world class teams.

One such area of research the APPG feels UK Sport should commission is whether talent identification by NGBS, through support by UK Sport and Sport England, fully engages all parts of society and nurtures any underlying and undiscovered talent.”

(APPG representing unfunded team sport)

“Essential for any opponent sport is to have a critical mass of athletes within the World Class environment particularly in a centralised programme. We would wish for flexibility based on justification to adapt the funding model to account for this sports specific requirement.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“A more flexible approach, particularly to the team sport agenda, is required. UK Sport could provide support for a significant improvement in a number of team sports through a similar approach but more flexible approach than has been taken to date. It is clear from any national media outlet that team sports are of huge importance in the UK.

For team sports, a different approach is required.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

“We ask that UK Sport review their funding to team sports. There is a strong belief in the sporting community that the current funding policy does [not] match the needs of team sports.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

A small number of sector stakeholders argued, in the context of team sport, that the athlete support model should be reviewed:

“The athlete support model was introduced nearly ten years ago and it seems timely for it to be reviewed to ensure it is fit for purpose moving forwards. This would also give the opportunity to give greater consideration to the model in relation to team sport athletes who are currently disadvantaged financially to their individual sport peers because of the need for greater numbers for specificity of training, therefore diluting the athlete awards.”

(Funded team sport NGB)

6.1.4. Stronger narrative to promote publicly funded high performance sport

A number of sector stakeholders argued that UK Sport needed to present a stronger, more coherent narrative for the benefits that publicly funded high-performance sport brings to society both in terms of social impact and participation impact in recreational sport. This will protect current levels of funding, and strengthen the argument for additional funding – from both Government and private sources.

“The role and work of UK Sport receives considerable coverage in mainstream media, and debate about its policies and decisions is rarely without controversy given the current profile of high performance sport in the UK. Whilst it has been effective in clarifying its mission in terms of results in global sporting events and the attraction of major events to the UK, it is likely that a more complete narrative exploring the benefits of sustaining a culture of sporting success to British Society and “UK plc” will be needed to persuade future governments of the value of its work. The development of such a narrative would also enable UK Sport to take a more prominent leadership and advocacy role for and on behalf of the whole sports community in the UK at times of opportunity or threat.”

(Higher Education institution)

“We need a cohesive strategy for sport in Britain which articulates one vision encompassing elite success and participation so the whole sport system is joined up to delivering an overall vision. The vision has to clearly articulate why we want to win for the greater good and benefit of sport.

This is the approach we have taken over a number of years [here] – elite success driving increases in participation which, in turn, make that elite success more sustainable.

However, it is not a case of just pouring money in the top end and hoping the benefits at grassroots will happen organically. Unless the strategy and the governance and management structures are there in a governing body, they will struggle to deliver success by any measure.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

6.1.5. Attracting private investment

Many workshop participants argued that more work could be done to attract commercial and philanthropic financial support, and that this would bring knock-on benefits in allowing UK Sport to fund more athletes and more sports:

“A commitment to work with and across sports to increase commercial interest in Olympic and Paralympic sports, individually and collectively. Only by doing this can we expect to see increased and sustained support from the private sector thus providing greater longer term security for the Performance system in the UK.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

6.1.6. Puncturing the ‘bubble’ around high-performance sport

It was also argued that the current approach can create an unnecessary ‘bubble’ around the high-performance part of an NGB’s remit, when high performance should be working with development, competition and membership in a mutually beneficial relationship:

“The UK sport investment into elite performance sport is a great opportunity for NGBs to transform their image and customer experience. Through medal success sports have the opportunity to connect with new target audiences, modernise and broaden their appeal. The UK Sport investment has encouraged a performance “bubble” to develop around elite sport that distances itself from other elements of an NGB’s operations – like development, competition and membership. UK Sport should consider to what extent the performance “bubble” is a necessary condition of success and whether there is a case to encourage sports to link their high performance success to their wider NGB operations. The true value of UK Sport investment is achieved by those NGBs who have used medal success as a catalyst for their whole sport experience linking through to the wider home nation talent pathways, participation programmes and event experience. If sports don’t do this they are wasting the investment. Therefore the ability over time to translate the investment into wider objectives could be a more explicit strategy and part of the investment approach.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

6.1.7. Assess whether Paralympic objectives are conflicting

It was argued that there is tension between conflicting objectives of (a) winning gold medals, and (b) maximising medals of all colours, and that this should be resolved before other countries catch up with higher levels of funding for their Paralympic competitors:

“A key UK Sport Paralympic objective for Rio is to deliver more medals than the previous cycle. Importantly, the Paralympic sports also agree gold medal targets. However, the two objectives can be at odds: Paralympic sports could successfully hit their medal targets but if the number of gold medals is not achieved, Britain will be lower on the medal table.

The dual objective then has an impact on how the World Class Programme is delivered: by driving a larger squad of athletes to deliver a high number of medals, programmes are also diluting resources for achieving gold medals via multi-medal winners. Conversely, if Para-sports sharpen their focus on gold medals, they reduce their potential to hit a high number of medals. Thus, the

programme becomes at odds with itself. A single objective is needed so that programme strategies can align and deliver.

It should also be noted that, as the ‘universality’ of the Paralympics progresses rapidly worldwide, the performance gap between the strong Paralympic nations (which includes Britain) and the others is already closing, and therefore the ‘performance gap’ between Olympic and Paralympic sports (i.e. the perceived relative levels of competitiveness) referred to in the UK Sport Investment Principles will also require review.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

6.1.8. Introduce a new ethical framework

Many stakeholders were keen to emphasise that the entire sporting system had a duty of care towards athletes and staff, and that UK Sport could lead in this area to protect their long-term health and wellbeing:

“Finally, we feel that more emphasis should be placed throughout the high performance system on the need for a clearer, more visible ethical framework that all partners and stakeholders sign up to. As the stakes rise and pressure grows as an inevitable by-product of success and higher aspirations, so does the need to be even more certain that we place the care and wellbeing of athletes and staff at the core of all we do. This is not to say that there are clear warning signs that have been missed, but to emphasise the need to learn from the mistakes of others and be proactive.”

(Higher Education institution)

“UKS like the other Sports Councils has made safeguarding a funding condition and encouraged the development and improvement of standards. However [we believe] whilst this is significant it does not go far enough and should be extended to cover individuals over the age of 18. [We have] evidence to suggest that the work of the cross sport “Steering Group for Vulnerable Adults” since it was formed in 2010 has been ineffective due to lack of funding and the lack of accountability or ownership by (some) sports. This should be looked at not only by UKS but also in collaboration with the other Sports Councils. UKS is to be

commended for its initial investment in a pilot managed by the EIS to support the mental welfare of elite athletes. It is still relatively in its early days and awareness of the service needs to be improved. However in a recent survey [of athletes] 100% of all respondents said that they saw this as an invaluable service and one that should not only be continued for those currently in performance sport but extended to those in transition (especially the first two years). Investment in this area, engaging with the other HN Institutes for sport could bring about a significant return in performance, retention and re-engagement of athletes after transition.”

(Body representing individual athletes)

6.2. Additional practical observations

6.2.1. Continue with the current investment principles

The current investment principles were defended by some stakeholders:

“Continue with the current investment principles, particularly around investing in specific performance business units which are linked to NGB’s as this allows the funding to be channelled directly into having the maximum athlete performance impact.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

6.2.2. Clearer communication of role and criteria to sector stakeholders

Many workshop participants felt that clearer communication of UK Sport’s mission, role and responsibilities, as well as transparency around its day-to-day operations would help to build trust and understanding:

“There is an opportunity within the context of this consultation, to provide greater clarity around the relationship between UK Sport funding and Sport England funding in relation to high performance and performance pathways. In terms of simplifying the process it could be broken down as; Sport England providing the central fund for the sport and supporting the development of

performance pathways and performance coaches while UK Sport focuses on the four year Olympic cycle of investing in athletes/teams that have a high chance of medal/world level success. UK Sport, for those sports it does not directly fund would provide world class research and performance resource.”

(Professional sport NGB)

“It is important that UK Sport develops clear and transparent processes for all its investment decisions, not just those relating to awards to NGBs. It is not entirely clear, for example, that the EIS always operates with universities in this way e.g. through engagement, allocation of PhDs, or the development of curricula.”

(Higher Education institution)

“The system and framework for the submission and evaluation of the Olympic cycle business cases and the subsequent annual ‘Mission Reviews’ were not clearly established from the outset, and there were inconsistencies throughout the process. Whilst the sports recognised that a new policy will experience teething problems, it created a feeling that the goalposts were moving, which led to some confusion about what was required and considerable duplication of time resources. Armed with the experience of the first Investment Process, all the fine detail should feature in the Tokyo Investment Guide – the ‘what ifs’ of the last cycle which had to be worked through and brought in as policy as we progressed, should be avoided. Furthermore, with a clear, detailed guide in place, there should be no need to create new versions of the Performance Investment Guide or modify the NGB Agreements mid-cycle.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

6.2.3. Set up a shared services facility

A shared services facility and / or greater investment in multipurpose sports infrastructure would help to maximise return on investment across all sports:

“I am not aware of any strong drive from UK Sport on efficiency or effectiveness of NGB programmes or in particular “shared services”. There has been a recent “purchasing” initiative but, in the short time that this project appears to have been running, there are no concrete outcomes. We would like to see UK Sport

explore investment in the use of a shared services facility for the provision of a variety of the items that all NGB's have to purchase.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Some better disabled infrastructure e.g. at Bisham would be helpful. There may be economies of scope and scale available through better purchasing in growing investment areas such as travel, accommodation, sports equipment and IT systems (small pieces of hardware, data management applications and security). A new function to advise and even broker investment sponsorship funding into individual sports for extraordinary items of programme expenditure could also be of great value.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Find additional ways to support the sports who are not currently delivering in order that they do not fall by the wayside. Continue to engage them and enable them to improve, otherwise some sports will fall too far behind and be even further away from the medal delivery objectives than they were when they stopped being funded.

Bring greater focus on joint funding and give opportunity for Sports-Sharing in which high performance sports can benefit from common systems and facilities.”

(Unfunded individual / small-team sport NGB)

“Invest in creating practical easy to use tools to help with performance and talent pathways.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

6.2.4. Information sharing and collaboration

In line with the previous remarks, some participants restated their support for information sharing and places on investment review panels for key stakeholders:

“[We] continue to welcome a collaborative approach with regard to investment decisions of Olympic sports. Further sharing of information, regular engagement between [us] and UK Sport Performance Advisor teams, as well as

invitations to sit on investment review panels are always welcome. In addition an awareness of international best practise on funding strategies should also inform UK Sports approach.”

(National body representing multiple sports)

Similarly, facilitating knowledge sharing around coaching and best practice was felt to be a critical responsibility of UK Sport:

“Continue to invest in developing coaching and sharing technical knowledge and services across sports (both funded and non-funded) as a more cost-effective alternative to that development happening solely within a sport.”

(Body representing sports coaches)

“Better facilitate the sharing of best practice around high performance and governance between Olympic and Paralympic sports.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

6.2.5. Review of process to minimise duplication and waste

Throughout the consultation process, many sector stakeholders expressed concerns about inefficiencies in the system more widely, and felt UK Sport could show leadership in this area:

“As part of the funding strategy review we would welcome a review of the governance requirements around sport funding with a view to ensuring consistency of approach, reducing duplication and making the requirements on the sector proportionate. Streamlining governance requirements to remove the need for multiple compliance would not only be welcomed by the sport sector, but would also generate potential efficiencies which could then be re-diverted back into sport.”

(Body representing multiple sports and athletes at all levels)

“UK Sport should show leadership in ensuring that resource is not being duplicated or wasted within the system.

This would mean continuing to build effective working partnerships with the BPA and BOA to create clarity and understanding around total levels of planned investment from NGBs in Games preparation and athlete development at the start of each cycle, so that additional revenues generated (e.g. via commercial programmes of the BPA and BOA) can be used to maximum effect elsewhere. It would also ensure that efforts to create commercial income across the system are not duplicated, especially by organisations looking to leverage the Olympic and Paralympic brands in ways that will confuse the marketplace.

It would also mean genuine shared expertise and information gathering around each summer and winter Games between the parties and other interested bodies such as the Sports Institutes to ensure that the British system is best placed to succeed on the world stage.”

(National body representing multiple sports)

“Review subcontract provision into sports particularly with Science and medicine where a sport could get better value and output from recruiting these services direct.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

Similarly, streamlining of the business case and mission review process was seen as a possible way of minimising drag on staffing resources:

“Some streamlining of the four year (business case) process and the annual Mission Reviews is required if we are to ensure that the process does not impact on performance. Feedback from our individual World Class Programmes suggests that the system is now a rolling process and is competing with the actual remit of performance staff. If the investment process is to be effective, it needs to minimise the time diverted from the programme itself.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

6.2.6. Home Country Sports Institutes (HCSIs) and the EIS

It was asserted by one respondent that the current HCSI programme depended on the EIS progressing to ‘world class’ status:

“UK Sport requires NGBs to use the services of the HCSIs as the first choice provider, to ensure a return on its own investment in HCSIs. If the return on investment is to be effective for sports and UK Sport, the EIS (in particular) must become the pre-eminent body for Sports Science and Medicine and be recognised as ‘world class’ in order to make the impact at the level needed.”

(Funded individual / small-team sport NGB)

6.2.7. Measurement and impact assessment

Promoting impact assessment, the use of new data and analytics, and monitoring public opinion were felt to be areas that cut across sports, and could therefore be delivered by UK Sport as a service to the sector as a whole:

“Alongside a wider public debate about the future of elite sport funding and funding for sport more generally, an independent impact assessment of the ‘no compromise’ policy on the future of the sport sector would help to inform the future strategy. [We] would welcome the opportunity to play a role in this wider debate and in conducting independent analysis in consultation with the sport sector, particularly given that a key role of the organisation is both to act as the voice of sport and to provide a consultative forum to provide views and evidence from across the sector to shape future policy.”

(Body representing multiple sports and athletes at all levels)

“Promote use of new data and analytics in performance sport.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

“Invest in social media tools to monitor/gauge public opinion.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

6.2.8. Incentives

Cash incentives were thought to be one way of encouraging larger NGBs to rebalance their revenue streams to move away from dependence on public funding:

“Create incentives for well-funded sports to leverage their success in generating commercial sponsorships thus reducing demands on public funding. One such incentive must encourage the channelling of sponsorship money into women sports as according to a recent study – Say Yes to Success – from the Women Sport and Fitness Foundation , only 0.4% of all sponsorship money goes into women sports, with media coverage at 5%.”

(Unfunded team sport NGB)

6.2.9. Innovation budget

A ring-fenced innovation budget was proposed by two sector stakeholders:

“We propose an agreed pot of money for new initiatives that might be of a UK dimension and could straddle generic areas.”

(Sports Council)

“Recognising the role of innovation and technical achievement – for example a specific innovation fund to support ongoing research and development.”

(Ineligible individual / small-team sport NGB)

6.2.10. Plan decision-making timeframes early

One organisation argued that greater clarity around decision processes and timings post-Rio would help to minimise unnecessary turnover of key employees in the sector:

“Decision making timeframes after the 2016 Rio Games are critical. If the pattern of previous Games is repeated there will be extensive turnover within sports (and possibly UK Sport) at the end of the Games a situation that will be increased if funding commitments are unclear in advance of the Games as staff seek positions offering job security.”

(Body representing multi-sport event)

6.2.11. Universities taking on responsibilities of underdeveloped NGBs

Where medal opportunities arise in sports with limited infrastructure, it was argued that universities may offer a cost effective alternative:

“There have been a number of occasions in the past where UK Sport has invested in small squads of athletes with viable medal opportunities in a minor sport with a very underdeveloped National Governing Body, which then proves to be not fit for purpose. An alternative approach to this scenario could be to embed a coaching and support programme for such athletes within a University high performance environment, with a service agreement brokered by UK Sport between the Institution and the NGB. This would significantly reduce overhead costs and reduce the isolation experienced by athletes and staff in very small programmes with minimal infrastructure.”

(Higher Education institution)

6.2.12. Leadership development

Investing more widely in leadership development was thought to be an opportunity for UK Sport to continue improving the sector:

“There may also be the need to widen the support to leadership development and the development of new collaborations and partnerships. All of these areas may be crucial to the development of genuinely world class organisations.”

(Body representing multiple sports and athletes at all levels)

6.2.13. Longer period for sports to prove progress

One sport argued that funding could be awarded initially and then withdrawn in too short a space of time:

“[We] believe a minimum period of two years should be granted before UK Sport funding is removed through a process of annual review. We support UK Sport’s unrelenting focus on performance but seven months is wholly insufficient time for a sport to make effective use of WCPP funding. A review after 18 months

would [afford] a more realistic view of the progress being made in utilising investment.”

(Professional sport NGB)

Conclusions

A wide range of strategic and practical improvements were put forward. Some of the strategic changes echoed points raised throughout the consultation, including the widespread desire for a more “joined up” system and specific concerns around team sports.

Other suggestions focused on a perceived need to improve the sustainability of high performance sport in the UK, by communicating a stronger narrative around it, working harder to attract private funding, and building an evidence base based on public opinion and impact assessment.

Many of the practical improvements are quite specific, so it would be beyond the scope of this study to evaluate their merit in turn. Suffice to say each is worthy of further discussion and consideration.

The vast majority of participants in the study were keen to stress that UK Sport was a successful organisation and that any improvements were incremental rather than radical.

APPENDIX 1: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

AIR	Annual Investment Review
APA	Athlete Personal Award
DCMS	Department for Culture Media and Sport
EIS	English Institute of Sport
GES	Gold Events Series
HCSC	Home County Sports Council: i.e. Sport England, sportscotland, Sport Wales and Sport Northern Ireland
HCSI	Home Country Sports Institute; i.e. English Institute of Sport, Sportscotland Institute of Sport, Welsh Institute of Sport, Northern Ireland Institute of Sport
IF	International Federation
IOC	International Olympic Committee
IPC	International Paralympic Committee
MST	Milestone Targets: Annual performance targets at the key annual competition, culminating in an Olympic and Paralympic performance target.
NGB	National Governing Body: Has responsibility for the governance of the sport in the UK.
Podium	UK Sport definition. Olympic Podium athletes are on a credible course to potentially win a medal in the upcoming Olympic Games. Paralympic Podium athletes are those demonstrating a credible Gold medal trajectory for the next Games.
Podium	UK Sport definition. Olympic Podium Potential athletes are defined as

Potential	those with a profile suggesting a credible trajectory towards winning an Olympic medal at the next Olympic Games (i.e. Tokyo 2020 or 2022). Paralympic Podium Potential athletes are those demonstrating a credible trajectory towards a medal (any colour) at the next Games (Rio/PyeongChang)
SE	Sport England
SIS	Scottish Institute of Sport
UKS	UK Sport
WCP	World Class Programme
WCPC	World Class Performance Conference
WIS	Welsh Institute of Sport
YST	Youth Sports Trust

APPENDIX 2: WRITTEN CONSULTATION FORM

A version of the following response form was made available on the UK Sport website, as well as being shared via email with sector stakeholders.

Consultation Document – UK Sport Performance Investment Strategy

Introduction

Thank you for downloading our consultation response document on the future investment strategy of UK Sport in high performance sport.

The aim of this consultation is to listen to those affected by the decisions that we make. We will consider these views when shaping a future strategy that builds on the development of the UK high performance system and the medal success we have had over the past decade.

We will always have to operate with finite resources and will have to make difficult choices, so we want to take this opportunity to step back to identify the range of options we might consider to drive the greatest impact from the investments that we make.

We want to ensure that while working with partners, we continue to make a unique contribution to the sporting landscape, delivering outcomes that the nation values.

We are proud to have led the investment in Olympic and Paralympic medal success and remain ambitious and focused on achieving what no host nation has done before, winning more medals in the Olympics and Paralympics at the next Games in Rio 2016.

We need to plan now for the period after Rio so that no momentum is lost and we want to hear your views: on our medal focus and the sports we support; on whether we should broaden or deepen our impact; or consider other factors when prioritising with finite resources. We want to know if there is anything we could do differently or better.

When considering the value that you place on our nation's sporting success, we'd ask you to reflect on the extent to which you feel there may be a heightened impact when a number of sports come together to win medals as Team GB and ParalympicsGB.

Participating

In order to participate in our consultation, we encourage you to look through the questions below and type in your views and opinions. This will enable us to analyse responses.

Once you have completed your submission, all you need to do is email this document to public.consultation@uksport.gov.uk

We may anonymously publish extracts of your submission as part of our summary of responses at the conclusion of our review. We will only make reference to your name if we have asked and been given your permission.

The deadline for submissions is **Wednesday 10 December**

Your Name *(optional if you are responding privately)*

Your Job Title *(please complete if you are responding formally on behalf of a group or organisation)*

Your Organisation *(please complete if you are responding formally on behalf of a group or organisation)*

Your Affiliation/Interests *(if you are completing this questionnaire because of a professional or personal affiliation with a sporting body, please write the name here. Please also list any particular sports you are interested in, or involved with.)*

The Consultation

The questions below capture the key themes of our review. Please feel free to say as much, or as little as you wish. We have provided some context to each question but more information can be found on our website www.uksport.gov.uk

QUESTION 1 – OUR PRIMARY FOCUS

UK Sport's current investment strategy focuses on **medal success**

Should the primary focus of our investment policy continue to be delivering medal success as the key outcome, or not?

Why?

QUESTION 2 – IN WHICH SPORTS SHOULD WE INVEST?

Currently, the only sports which are eligible for consideration for UK Sport performance investment are those sports on the Olympic and Paralympic programme.

Should our investment approach continue to focus solely on Olympic and Paralympic sports, or not?

If not, should the approach be broadened to include other UK-level sports or disciplines? What might be included and why?

QUESTION 3 – MAXIMISING THE IMPACT OF INVESTMENT

At the present time, we measure our impact and success primarily by the numbers of medals that Great Britain wins at Olympic and Paralympic Games, and the numbers of British medallists who are subsequently created.

In your view what factors (besides medals and medallists) can or do demonstrate 'success' in high performance sport, and how would you like to see UK Sport incorporate these into our strategy?

QUESTION 4 – 'DEEPER' INVESTMENT TO UNDERPIN EVEN LONGER TERM SUCCESS

Should UK Sport consider investing in or supporting sports or athletes who are further down the performance pathway i.e. those who are more than 8 years away from winning a medal, or not?

If so, on what basis could UK Sport invest or provide support?

QUESTION 5 – PRIORITISING FINITE INVESTMENTS

In the current four year investment cycle, UK Sport is investing a total of £380m of National Lottery and Exchequer income directly in 45 Summer & Winter Olympic & Paralympic sports.

In the context of having finite resources, how would you suggest that UK Sport prioritises its future investments?

What should be our top investment priority following the Rio Olympic/Paralympic Games?

QUESTION 6 – FURTHER IMPROVEMENTS TO OUR APPROACH

We expect the sports that we fund to focus on continuous improvement to be 'world leading' organisations and we also expect it of ourselves.

Do you have any further ideas or views on what we might do improve our investment approach in high performance sport?

ABOUT YOU

UK Sport is committed to equality and diversity. To help us ensure that this consultation includes responses from the widest possible range of people, we would be grateful if you could complete the questions below. Please feel free to skip this section if you would prefer not to answer.

I would prefer not to answer these questions

What is your sex?

Male Female

How old were you at your last birthday?

How would you describe your national identity?

- English
- Welsh
- Scottish
- Northern Irish
- British
- Other (write in)

What is your ethnic group?

A. White

- English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British
- Irish
- Gypsy or Irish Traveller
- Any other white background (write in)

B. Mixed/multiple ethnic groups

- White and Black Caribbean
- White and Black African
- White and Asian

Any other mixed/multiple ethnic background (write in)

C. Asian/Asian British

Indian

Pakistani

White and Asian

Chinese

Any other Asian background (write in)

D. Black/African/Caribbean/Black British

African

Caribbean

White and Asian

Any other mixed/multiple ethnic background (write in)

E. Other ethnic group

Arab

Any other ethnic group (write in)

Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?

Yes, limited a lot

Yes, limited a little

No



Thank you for taking the time to engage with this consultation. The Board and Executive Team at UK Sport are committed to ensuring that your feedback is considered as part of the overall consultation as we develop our post-Rio 2016 performance investment strategy.

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX 3: DELIBERATIVE WORKSHOP PLAN

A version of the following discussion plan was used for the deliberative workshops in Loughborough, London, and Cardiff.

Introductions

This section aims to thank delegates for attending, explain the reasons behind the consultation and what the consultation is for, and introduce ComRes.

11:00 – 11:20am: Welcome presentation

11:20 – 11:25am: ComRes introduction

11:25 – 11:30am: Delegate introduction

Challenges and opportunities for high performance sport

This section situates the workshop in context, and enables individuals to express their personal viewpoints before moving to look at the specific funding challenges UK Sport has outlined. In addition, this will capture any unanticipated insight.

11:30 – 12:00pm: Moderator to begin group discussion [ComRes]

- **To begin the discussions today, we want to find out what, if anything, you think are the main challenges for high performance sports in the UK in the next few years?**
[Moderator to list on flipchart]
- *Probe: funding, medal success, performance pathways to develop potential talent, continued frontline impact, recruitment retention and development of coaches/managers, etc., successful partnership relationships, continued governance, etc.*
- **And what, if anything, do you think are the main opportunities for high performance sports in the UK in the next few years?**
[Moderator to list on flipchart]
- *Probe: aftermath of London 2012, potential at Rio 2016, increased public support of Lottery funded sports, world-class*

quality coaches/managers, etc., successful partnership relationships, continued governance, etc.

11:50 – 12:00pm: Coffee

- UK Sport to be present to answer any questions from delegates.

Which sports should be considered eligible for UK Sport investment

This section aims to probe into the perceptions of which sports should be eligible for consideration for UK Sport's performance investment.

12:00 – 12:15pm: Moderator to bring group back together [ComRes]

- As you are all aware from the presentation earlier and from your broader expertise, UK Sport's investment approach currently focuses solely on Olympic and Paralympic sports.
- I would like you to split into your groups and discuss the benefits and drawbacks of the current approach, looking at reasons for and against including additional sports.
- After you have identified these, can both groups consider which other sports might be included? Rationale? Please use the materials in front of you to note down your thoughts. You have ten minutes to discuss this in your group, and when we come back together I would like you to present your thoughts to the other group.
- [Moderator to roam between groups, probing ideas]
- *Probe: Commonwealth sports, professional sports, other non-Olympic/Paralympic sporting activities*

12:15 – 12:30pm: Moderator to bring group back together [ComRes]

- [Groups to present their ideas]
- Is there anything missing from these lists that you perceive to be a key benefit or downside to investment in only Olympic or Paralympic sports? Is there anything that you disagree with?
- What, if anything, do you think determines whether a sport should or shouldn't be eligible to receive funding by UK Sport?

- [Moderator to list on flip chart]

Potential for longer term investment

This section is designed to look briefly at the prospect of longer term investment in athletes beyond the current 8-year approach.

12:30 – 1:00pm: Moderator to bring group back together [ComRes]

- UK Sport's current investment approach means investing only in sports and athletes who can demonstrate a realistic chance of medal success in either the next or the following Paralympics or Olympics – that is, within the next eight years. Its Home Nation Sports Council Partners also invest Public and National Lottery money to support sports and athletes at community and development levels.
- As part of the consultation, we'd like to look at whether UK Sport should consider investing in or supporting sports or athletes who are further down the performance pathway – that is, those who are more than 8 years away from winning a medal – or not?
- In your groups, can you brainstorm a list of the PROs and the CONs of a longer term investment approach? This should be for UK high performance sport as a whole, but please bring to life through specific examples. Please use the grid on your table to fill in your ideas.
 - *Probe: What would it look like?*
 - [Moderator to roam between groups probing ideas]
 - [Groups present their ideas]
 - **LIZ NICHOLL Sum up of morning – where did we get to in terms of exploring both 'broader' and 'deeper' considerations?**

1:00 – 1:30pm: LUNCH

What additional measures of success might we use?

This section aims to build a clear picture of other ways that success could be measured in addition to/as well as through winning medals.

1:45 – 2:15pm: Continue group discussion [ComRes] SPLIT INTO GROUPS

- [PRESENT VIEWS FROM PREVIOUS WORKSHOP(S) WHERE RELEVANT]
- At present, UK Sport measures ‘success’ by how many Olympic and Paralympic medals are won and how many medallists are created, a number that has steadily increased. Looking at the sports you have listed, how additionally would you measure the success of these sports to evaluate the benefit of funding?
- *Probe: participation, wider societal benefits, inspiration for young people, impact on local communities, impact nationally, popularity of sports, income from ticket sales of sports, pursuit of ‘hard’ vs ‘soft’ medals*
- [Moderator to list on flip chart]
- And how would each of these factors be measured objectively?
- *Probe: key performance indicators, statistics, other measures*
- Now that we have identified a long list of other measurable factors, as a group, we would like to put these into some kind of general order – a general ranking, or sense of their importance. In a moment we’re going to examine this and probe in more detail...

(TO RUN STRAIGHT ON)

How would you prioritise investment?

2.00 – 2:40pm:

- **LIZ NICHOLL and other UK Sport staff available to help with technical points.**
- The purpose of this section is to consider, in the light of the groups of sports you have identified, and the other measurable success factors we have discussed, how would you prioritise investment?
- To put this in context, UK Sport’s investment priorities in the context of the finite resources available to the organisation – £380m in the current four-year investment cycle, spread across 45 Summer & Winter Olympic & Paralympic sports.

- So, against this backdrop, and using the factors we have identified, we want to put you in the driving seat – How would you prioritise investment? How might you weight these factors? Which are the most significant? How might they be factored together? What is their relative importance? How might you ‘score’ sports against these investment criteria?
- I would like you to split into groups to consider this
- We’ll give you 20 minutes as a group to come up with a very headline framework or approach which you could apply to determine and prioritise investments. Then, we’re going to reconvene, share views, and explain your prioritisation.
- [Groups divide and discuss with facilitator overseeing]
- [Moderator to roam between groups probing ideas]

2.35 – 2:45pm: Reconvene and share answers by group

Other improvements / any other business

This section is designed to look at anything else UK Sport can do overall

2:40 – 3:00pm: Moderator to bring groups back together [ComRes]

- [Thank all participants for their contributions so far]
- Finally, we’ve covered a lot of broad strategic issues for UK Sport today, and we’ll be pulling all of this together into a comprehensive review of the consultation findings.
- We’d now like to look at any practical recommendations you have for how UK Sport can improve upon its successes so far – things like the way it makes decisions, the timings of its decision, the way it communicates to stakeholders.
- In your groups, can you please try to agree a list of just two simple improvements (“quick wins”) that UK Sport could make?
- [Moderator to roam between groups probing ideas]
- *Probes: is this a feasible change? What would the positive consequences be? Would there be any negative consequences? Will this command the support of all stakeholders?*

- [Groups present their findings]
- [Thank all participants for their attendance]

Please do remember that there is also a written consultation still open, and that your detailed feedback via the written consultation forms will go into the final consultation report. If there's anything that has come up today that you feel you haven't had a chance to discuss in depth, then please do send a contribution to the written section of the consultation. UK Sport will be available after this session to discuss anything that has come up and talk you through the next steps. **UK Sport present to answer questions from delegates**

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX 4: FURTHER READING

Rio Performance Investment Principles:

http://www.uk sport.gov.uk/docLib/Rio_Investment_Principles.pdf

CONFIDENTIAL



ABOUT COMRES

ComRes is an independent research consultancy based in Westminster. It is a founding member of the British Polling Council, and its staff are members of the UK Market Research Society, committing it to the highest standards of research practice.

It has previously conducted major research projects and consultations in the culture, media and sport sector for clients including Arts Council England, Visit Britain, The Football Association, and Visit Scotland. The team that delivered this project includes consultants who have previously worked with the Premier League and other major sporting organisations.

ComRes recently won the 2014 Market Research Society Award for Public Policy / Social Research. It also conducts regular public research for organisations including The Independent, ITV News, the BBC, and other media outlets, as well as a wide range of public sector and corporate clients.

For further information about ComRes stakeholder consultations and any other research requirements please contact Katharine.Peacock@comres.co.uk