

---

Minutes of the 2nd Meeting: 11 March 2002

---

Present

CHAIRMAN

Sir Rodney Walker

MEMBERS

Gareth Davies  
Adrian Metcalfe  
Zahara Hyde Peters

Craig Reddie  
Eric Saunders  
Gavin Stewart

CO-ORDINATING GROUP OF CHIEF OFFICERS

Richard Callicott	Chief Executive, UK Sport
Simon Clegg	Chief Executive, British Olympic Association
Eamonn McCartan	Sports Council for Northern Ireland
Huw Jones	Chief Executive, Sports Council for Wales

UK SPORT STAFF

Jerry Bingham	Head of Strategy, Ethics & Research	(Council Secretary)
Roger Moreland	Director, UK Sports Institute	
Liz Nicholl	Director, Performance Services	
John Scott	Director, International Relations & Major Events	
Gary Lee	Operations Manager, Anti-Doping	

## Apologies For Absence

- 1 Apologies had been received from Trevor Brooking, Alastair Dempster, Tanni Grey-Thompson, Des Wilson, David Moffett and Ian Robson.

## Introduction

- 2 The Chairman introduced the meeting by informing Members that the Secretary of State had now agreed a revised person specification for Council Members and that it was therefore to be hoped that the current vacancies on the Council could be filled without further undue delay.

## Minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2002

- 3 The minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2002 were confirmed as a true record.

## Lottery Strategy: Submission to Secretary of State (UKSC 13 2002)

- 4 Members considered the final draft Lottery Strategy as sent to the Secretary of State for Culture, Media & Sport and to Ministers with responsibility for sport in the devolved administrations. Two particular points were raised in discussion: first, that the Strategy should make reference to UK Sport's diverse relationships with the major spectator sports as well as with its traditional (governing body) partners; and second, that, in relation to the "one stop shop" concept, there is a dangerous expectation among UK/GB governing bodies which do not receive funding from UK Sport that they will do so from the Home Country Sports Councils.
- 5 **Taking account of these points, Members ratified the final draft Lottery Strategy, subject any comments received by the Secretary of State, for formal adoption by April 2002.**

## UK Awards Panel: Report of the Meetings held on 21 January and 25 February 2002 (UKSC 14 2002)

- 6 Members endorsed the following Lottery-funding recommendations of the Panel:

### Annual review of Priority One summer Olympic sports

#### Athletics (Zahara Hyde Peters declared an interest in this item)

- 6.1 **That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £1,969,222 pa be confirmed for UK Athletics (to be paid pro tem via Performance Athlete Services), this sum being the annual equivalent of the four year award of £7,876,888.**

Cycling

- 6.2 That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £1,767,525) be confirmed for British Cycling, this sum being £72,379 over the annual equivalent of £1,695,146 but to be managed within the four year award of £6,780,582.

Rowing (Gavin Stewart declared an interest in this item)

- 6.3 That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £1,717,349 be confirmed for the Amateur Rowing Association, this sum being the annual equivalent of the four year award of £6,869,396.

Sailing

- 6.4 That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £1,290,000 be confirmed for the Royal Yachting Association, this sum being in line with the year 2 budget requirement already identified within the four year award of £5,030,000.

Priority 1 New AwardsSailing – Special Projects Funding

- 6.5 That the RYA be made a further (Year 2) award of £80,000 for the purchase and development of sail boats.

Athletics – Special Projects Funding

- 6.6 That UK Athletics be made a further (year 2) special project award of £100,000 for the Sports Science Co-ordination Panel, subject to the UKSI keeping a watching brief, the receipt of satisfactory reports, and confirmation of the need for funding.

Rowing – Special Projects Funding (Gavin Stewart declared an interest in this item)

- 6.7 That the ARA be awarded an additional sum of up to £142,965 in 2002/03 in respect of new and continuing special projects in the field of boat design and instrumentation, spinal motion, IT database, and Powerbreathe as identified, subject to the involvement of the UKSI in the development (and subsequent implementation) of the projects, and receipt of detailed and acceptable proposals in respect of each project.

Annual review of Priority Two summer Olympic sportsCanoeing

- 6.8 That a year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £855,199 be confirmed for the British Canoe Union, this sum being £5,199 over the annual equivalent of £850,000 but to be managed within the four year award of £3,400,000.

Equestrian

- 6.9 **That a year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £900,000 be confirmed for the British Equestrian Federation, this sum being in line with the original planned budget for year 2, and to be managed within the four year award of £3,500,000. The award was made subject to the cap on funding for the Show Jumping element of the WCPP remaining at £150,000 and the Dressage discipline at £150,000 (plus the cost of the Performance Manager which is a shared post with Paralympic dressage.)**

In making this award, members noted that the Chief Executive of British Showjumping was currently under suspension pending investigation of the alleged appropriation of WCPP funds for event purposes, and that the newly-confirmed funding for show jumping would be channelled through the BEF.

Judo

- 6.10 **That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £820,000 be confirmed for the British Judo Association, this sum being the annual equivalent of the four-year award of £3,280,000.**

Modern Pentathlon

- 6.11 **That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £350,000 be confirmed for the Modern Pentathlon Association of Great Britain, this sum being £11,000 less than the annual equivalent of the existing four year award of £1,443,000.**

Target Shooting

- 6.12 **That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £284,963 be confirmed for the Great Britain Target Shooting Federation against the four year award of £980,000. Although the sum was nearly £40,000 over the annual equivalent is £245,000, savings of £30-£40,000 would be made in year one of the new programme.**

Badminton

- 6.13 **That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £62,500 be confirmed for the British Badminton Olympic Committee, this sum being the annual equivalent of the four year award of £250,000.**

Swimming

- 6.14 **That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £1,192,267 be confirmed for the Amateur Swimming Federation of Great Britain, this sum being £37,733 less than the annual equivalent of the four year award of £4,920,000.**

Priority 2 New Award

Modern Pentathlon – additional core programme funding

- 6.15 **That an additional programme funding award of £42,000 be made to the Modern Pentathlon Association of Great Britain for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2005 in respect of additional costs relating to contractual salary adjustments on WCPP contracts.**

Annual review of Priority Three summer Olympic sports

Diving

- 6.16 **That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £220,000 be confirmed for the Amateur Swimming Federation of Great Britain in respect of diving, this sum being £4,000 over the annual equivalent of the four year award of £864,000. (It was noted in this respect that the Performance Director for diving was re-locating to the United Kingdom as a full time appointment.)**

Triathlon

- 6.17 **That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £429,300 be confirmed for the British Triathlon Association, this sum being the annual equivalent of the four year award of £1,717,200.**

Priority 3 New Awards

Diving – elite coach at Sheffield

- 6.18 **That an additional award of £30,000 (£10K for each of three years) be made to the ASFGB as a contribution to the full time appointment of an elite diving coach at Sheffield for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2005.**

British Gymnastics – Rhythmic

- 6.19 **That a programme funding award of £82,790 be made to British Gymnastics for the discipline of Rhythmic for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2005 (year 1 - £25,090: year 2 - £31,800: year 3 - £25,900), this award being made in recognition of the recent progress of British gymnasts in this discipline, but being subject to a review after the 2003 world championships, when Olympic medal potential would be considered.**

Priority 4 New Awards

Archery (Priority 4 able bodied / Priority 2 disability)

- 6.20 **£360,000 be made to the Grand National Archery Society for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2005 to include support for the appointment of a National Coach, the allocation of programme costs to be made on a 60:40% basis between disabled and able bodied disciplines, thus reflecting the balance of costs applied for.**

## Taekwondo

- 6.21 **That a programme funding award of £360,000 be made to the sport of Taekwondo for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2005, the payment to be made to the British Taekwondo Council, the recognised governing body, but on the strict basis that the money be administered for the purposes of the Olympic discipline (ie through the British Taekwondo Control Board)**

## British Paralympic Association and Paralympic Sports

- 7 Members also considered a number of Lottery awards to the British Paralympic Association and Paralympic Sports. In respect of the Awards Panel's recommendation to make a new award to the British Paralympic Association, which represented an increase on the current funding level, consequent upon a review of the support required to keep British Paralympic sport on track to top the medals table at Athens in 2004, Members expressed a number of concerns, including:
- 7.1 The need to be alert to the possibility of double funding for certain sports – ie. via the BPA on one hand: via the relevant sport-specific organisation on the other;
- 7.2 Doubts as to the proportion of expenditure which directly impacts upon individual athletes
- 7.3 Doubts as to whether the BPA was being made to work hard enough in raising sponsorship income
- 8 **Partly in the light of these concerns, it was agreed to endorse the Panel's recommendations in respect of years 1 and 2 of the award, but to reduce the Year 3 award by 25%, with the balance to be retained as a contingency: i.e -**

	2002/03 £	2003/04 £	2004/05 £
<b>In principle funding agreed by UKSC in 2001</b>	196,978	359,036	615,056
<b>Funding requested</b>	512,892	528,195	1,099,142 (less targeted sponsorship of £288,000)
<b>Less underspend from 2000/01 and 2001/02</b>	149,000	N/A	N/A
<b>Programme award</b>	363,892	528,195	811,142 x 0.75 =608,357

- 9 Members also endorsed the following Lottery-funding recommendations of the Panel:

Annual review of Priority One summer Paralympic sports

Disability Athletics

- 9.1 **That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of up to £507,754 be confirmed in respect of disability athletics against a four year award of £2,263,200, this figure being based on the Technical Director's request for £641,055 less carried forward underspend of £133,301 (see below) from 2000/01.**
- 9.2 **That a de-commitment of £58,000 be made from the four year award on the basis that there was no evidence that the sport required the funding given the history of underspend, and that the funding be used for other priority cases.**

Disability Swimming

- 9.3 **That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £797,855 be confirmed in respect of disability swimming, this sum being £41,855 over the annual equivalent of £756,000 but to be managed within the four year award of £3,024,000.**

Priority 2 New Awards

Powerlifting

- 10 **That a programme funding award of £50,000 be made to the British Weightlifters Association for disabled powerlifting for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003.**

Shooting

- 11 **That a programme funding award of £43,494 be made to the British Paralympic Shooting Association of £43,494 for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003.**

Priority 3 New Awards

Table Tennis

- 12 **That a programme funding award of £57,686 be made to the British Table Tennis Association for People with Disabilities for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003.**

Annual review of Priority Four summer Paralympic sports

Wheelchair Basketball

- 13 **That a Year 2 (2002/3) budget for programme costs of £229,625 be confirmed for wheelchair basketball against a two year award of £400,000.**

Priority 4 New AwardsFencing

- 14 **That a programme funding award of £30,000 be made to the British Disabled Fencing Association for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003.**
- 15 Members also noted that, in respect of Wheelchair Tennis, there is no programme award (the Panel has agreed to an increase in athletes from 8 to 10 if they meet criteria); that, in respect of Wheelchair Rugby, the existing award runs to 30 September 2002 when a review of the World Championships will take place; and that, in respect of Goalball, there is no award recommendation as Goalball no longer has a World Class Performance Programme.

Athlete Medical Scheme for priority 3 and 4 sports

- 16 **That a 2002/3 commitment of approximately £66,000 of Lottery funding be made to British Olympic Association, to be paid against invoice, to enable priority 3 and 4 athletes and Paralympic athletes to access the Athlete Medical Scheme. (The UKSI was supporting athletes from Priority 1 and 2 sports through Exchequer funds)**
- 17 Members endorsed the following Exchequer-funding recommendations of the Panel:

UK Athletics

- 17.1 **That a standstill award of £450,000 be made to UK Athletics for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003 to be allocated as follows:**
- Chief Executive's Office, finance, development and competition (£400,000)
  - Anti-doping (£50,000)

Sailing

- 17.2 **That a standstill award of £361,000 be made to the Royal Yachting Association for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003 to be allocated as follows:**
- Yacht Racing £271,000
  - Windsurfing £65,000
  - Disability Sailing £25,000
- 17.3 **That a planning figure of £361,000 be issued for 2003/04.**

Priority 2Modern Pentathlon

- 17.4 **That an award of £100,000 be made to the Modern Pentathlon Association of Great Britain for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003.**
- 17.5 **That a planning figure of £100,000 be issued for 2003/04.**



Judo

- 17.6 That a planning figure of up to £210,000 be offered to the British Judo Association for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003, subject to this figure being reviewed periodically during the year, taking into account developments in relation to the post of Chief Executive (interim and full time), and any related revisions to the Corporate Plan and any support provided for the World Class plan.
- 17.7 That a planning figure of £210,000 be issued for 2003/04.

Priority 3Triathlon

- 17.8 That a standstill award of £113,200 be made to the British Triathlon Association for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003 to be allocated as follows:
- |   |                         |         |
|---|-------------------------|---------|
| - | Development (Education) | £25,000 |
| - | Excellence              | £25,000 |
| - | Business Organisation   | £63,200 |
- 17.9 That an additional one off grant of £5,000 be made for risk assessment training for organisers of all events sanctioned by the BTA, subject to the ability of UK Sport to accommodate this award in the 2002/03 budget.
- 17.10 That a planning figure of £113,200 be issued for 2003/04.

Other Exchequer sports awardsFencing

- 17.11 That a standstill award of £140,000 be made to the British Fencing Association for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003 in support of the implementation of year 2 of the corporate plan 2001-2005. The grant to be allocated as follows, subject to UK Sport agreeing the specific activities and areas to fund:
- |   |                                      |         |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------|
| - | international division programme     | £60,000 |
| - | competition programme and FIE events | £10,000 |
| - | support to 8 named fencers           | £30,000 |
| - | core infrastructure                  | £40,000 |

Wrestling

- 17.12 That a standstill award of £40,000 for core funding be made to the British Wrestling Association for the period 1 January to 31 December 2002.

- 17.13 That officers will explore the development of a more cost effective support programme for two wrestlers who may meet the definition of "world class".

#### Weightlifting

- 17.14 That an award of £25,000 be made to the British Weightlifters Association of £25,000 for the period 1 January to 30 June 2002.

#### Hang Gliding and Paragliding

- 17.15 That a standstill award of £50,000 be made to the British Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003 to be allocated as follows:

- |                                 |         |
|---------------------------------|---------|
| - Safety, Training and Coaching | £35,000 |
| - Performance and Excellence    | £15,000 |

#### Olympic Sports Development Fund (British Olympic Association)

- 17.16 That an award of £50,000 be made to the British Olympic Association for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003 in support of the Olympic Sports Development Fund.

In making this award, Members noted that their decision was likely to trigger a contribution of £25,000 from the BOA and that future funding would be considered in the light of the Government's Spending Review

#### Other Organisations

##### British Paralympic Association

- 17.17 That a standstill core funding award of £120,000 be made to the British Paralympic Association for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003.
- 17.18 That a planning figure of £120,000 be issued for 2003/04.

##### National Sports Medicine Institute

- 17.19 That an award of £215,225 ( a reduction on the previous award of £300,000) be made to the National Sports Medicine Institute for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003, subject to:
- The NSMI committing to realign its work during 2002/3 and, in the funding areas, to reflect the findings emerging from the strategy work being conducted by UK Sport
  - Officers reporting back to Council in the autumn 2002 following a review of progress in this respect

17.20 That the award initially be allocated as follows:

- RESCU £67,105
- Standards £14,500
- Education up to £76,268
- Network up to £57,532

17.21 that discussions be held with Sport England with a view to ascertaining whether a greater contribution could be made towards NSMI management costs to support any direct delivery requirements.

17.22 that NSMI be advised to review its charging policies for its courses to ascertain whether the market will bear increased fees.

17.23 that should the outcome of 17.21 and 17.22 above be positive then consideration be given to achieving further savings in the level of grant.

17.24 That an additional £40,000 for the Information Services Programme subject to confirmation by UKSI of the value of the programme to the Institute's objectives.

United Kingdom Sports Association for People with Learning Disabilities (UKSA)

17.25 That a standstill grant of £50,000 be made to the United Kingdom Sports Association for People with Learning Disabilities for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003, subject to the following conditions:

- that should either the Chief Executive or the Administrative Officer leave, a review of UKSA's ability to deliver its activities will be reviewed in conjunction with UK Sport
- that UKSA will develop, as a priority, its supporting work for learning disabled athletes on the WCPP of athletics and swimming
- that all costs associated with supporting the administration of INAS-FID Europe are met from within the grant allocation
- that UKSA continues to work towards resolving the issue with the English Sports Association for People with Learning Disability (ESAPLD), and continues to ensure that English athletes are not directly affected by the current situation.

18 Members endorsed the following Modernisation Programme recommendation of the Panel:

Sailing

18.1 That a modernisation grant of £85,000 be made to the Royal Yachting Association for an organisational and strategic review, subject to a detailed breakdown of expenditure and clarification of the outputs.

## Modernisation Programme for National Governing Bodies – Progress, Future Directions and Priorities (UKSC 15 2002)

- 19 Liz Nicholl introduced paper UKSC 15 2002, making recommendations about future directions and priorities for the Modernisation Programme. She drew particular attention to the pending introduction of a formal application process as a response to those governing bodies who claim to have felt “divorced” from the Programme. Members acknowledged that the modernisation task was a complex one which faced many challenges – not least the “competing factions” which are sometimes to be found in governing bodies and which are, perversely, often a product of democratic systems of governance.
- 20 Members indicated that they hoped to see a “blueprint” of the model governing body emerging from the various modernisation projects now on stream or proposed. Officers pointed out that several live projects, including those involving the Royal Yachting Association and the British Canoe Union, were very much in line with just such a concept. At the same time it was acknowledged that the kind of policy proposals likely to result from these pieces of work would, however worthy, have the potential effect of putting additional pressures on to the governing bodies.
- 21 **In conclusion, Members noted the progress made to date and approved a raft of recommendations (Annex E of the paper) concerning the principles, process and funding of the Modernisation Programme, together with related communications and dissemination issues. The question of delegated authority arose, in which respect it was agreed the UK Awards Panel be given delegated authority to approve awards of up to £100,000 per project, and that the Director of Performance Services be given delegated authority of up to £35,000. In both cases, however, it was agreed that such delegation should only apply to applications which clearly fell within the broad definition of the Programme, and that the Council itself would reserve the right to look at applications which fell outside these parameters.**

## Report of Major Events Steering Group held on 13 February 2001 (UKSC 16 2002)

- 22 Members endorsed the following recommendations of the MESH on awards to be made from the World Class Events Programme:

### 1999 World Judo Championships

- 22.1 **That the surplus revealed by the final accounts be allocated towards sports development**

### 2008 European Football Championships Joint Bid

- 22.2 **That an award of up to £320,000 be made towards the joint Scottish/Irish joint bid for the 2008 European Football Championships, subject to**

- **the grant being repaid in the event that the Championships do not proceed in Scotland & Ireland because of a failure to construct the necessary stadia**
- **an agreement that the sports development strategy be implemented prior to the hosting of the Championships**

In making this award, Members noted that the issue of "Stadium Ireland" had been "parked" during the forthcoming Irish General Election, but that it was possible that the current 85,000-seater design might eventually be scaled down. At the same time, there appeared to be a growing possibility that Croke Park, the traditional home of Gaelic sports, might be made available for soccer in the event of a successful bid.

#### 2005 UEFA Under 19 Football Championships – Northern Ireland

(Eric Saunders declared an interest in this item)

- 22.3 **that, subject to the outcome of the bid for this event (a decision was due on 25 May), an award of £196,000 be made towards the staging of the 2005 UEFA Under 19 Football Championships.**

#### 2002 European Short Course Swimming Championships - Edinburgh

- 22.4 **that, subject to the development of a business plan, in principle support be provided for the staging of the 2002 European Short Course Swimming Championships in Edinburgh.**

- 23 Members noted that, should an application for the 2006 World Rowing Championships prove successful, then support in excess of £1 million was likely to be required from the World Class Events Programme.

#### UK Sport Appeals Procedures (UKSC 17 2002)

- 24 Liz Nicholl introduced paper UKSC 17 2002, concerning the proposed adoption of a procedure for appeals against decisions made under the Lottery and Exchequer programmes of UK Sport. She drew particular attention to the proposed appointment of an independent assessor whose role would be to determine if appellants had legitimate grounds of appeal, in which case the appeal would be returned to the original decision making body, usually the Council itself. There are currently two appeals pending in relation to Athlete Personal Awards.
- 25 **Members endorsed the appeals procedures set out in the Annexes to these minutes, with a view to the procedures becoming operational as soon as possible. It was also agreed that the Coordinating Group of Chief Officers consider the new procedures to ensure a consistency of approach across the Sports Councils.**

#### UK Sports Institute (UKSC 18 2002)

- 26 Members noted the report, in particular the steps being taken to review the future structure of the UKSI Board. This review was being carried out because of a perception:

- 26.1 that the current composition of the Board does not make it suited to monitoring the performance of the UKSI Central Services Team; and
- 26.2 that the structure and responsibility for the network of institutes across the UK limits the role of the Board as currently constituted

### Anti-Doping Programme for the Olympic Games in Salt Lake City (UKSC 19 2002)

- 27 Gary Lee introduced paper UKSC 19 2002 paper, outlining the recent Winter Olympics anti-doping preparation programme, in particular the results of the testing programme operated by UK Sport for Britain's Salt Lake City.
- 28 He reported that pre-Games test targets had been exceeded in all but two of the relevant sports, and that British athletes had all been tested negative in this part of the programme. It was noted that there had been some difficulties in accessing the alpine skiers prior to the Games, as a result of which the figures for the testing of the alpine skiing team were not as high as planned: that said, it was acknowledged that access is not as unfamiliar problem in relation to winter sports athletes who spend the majority of their time training and competing abroad. There was scope, too, for improvements in inter-agency cooperation and communication.
- 29 It was acknowledged that the successes outlined in the paper had to some extent subsequently been tarnished by the positive finding in relation to Alain Baxter, whose hearing was pending at the time of the meeting. Craig Reddie reported that there had been some delay in arranging the hearing because IOC procedures were not set up to deal with test results announced after the Games.

### Audit Committee: minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2002

- 30 Members received the minutes.

### Budget 2002/3 (UKSC 20 2002)

- 31 Item deferred to the next meeting

### Any Other Business

- 32 Members acknowledged the excellent performance of the British team at the recent Winter Olympics and offered their congratulations to the British Olympic Association accordingly.

### Date of Next Meeting

- 33 Monday 13 May 2002 in Manchester (details to be confirmed)

## Annex A

---

# UK Sport Appeals Procedures: World Class Performance Programme/World Class Events Programme and Exchequer Grants

---

## Introduction

- 1 This appeals procedure will apply in respect of applications made to UK Sport for Lottery and Exchequer funding specifically:
  - 1.1 **applications from Governing Bodies for funding from the World Class Performance Programme;**
  - 1.2 **applications from Governing Bodies, Local Authorities and other event organisers for funding from the World Class Events Programme;**
  - 1.3 **applications from Governing Bodies and other organisations for Exchequer funding.**
- 2 The criteria according to which such applications are considered and the procedure for making applications are set out separately. The criteria for the WCPP and WCEP are attached.
- 3 This appeals procedure only applies where an application made to UK Sport for Lottery and Exchequer funding is unsuccessful.

## Decision-making body

- 4 This appeals procedure applies to decisions made by the UK Sports Council, and, where applicable under delegated authority, the UK Awards Panel, the Major Events Steering Group, and decisions made by Chairman's Action on behalf of the UK Sports Council.

## Reasons for rejection

- 5 Whenever an application made to UK Sport for Lottery and Exchequer funding is unsuccessful, brief reasons will be given to the applicant explaining why the application was unsuccessful.
- 6 Save in exceptional circumstances an application will only be unsuccessful where:
  - 6.1 **it fails to meet the criteria according to which such application is considered; and/or**

6.2 **the procedure for making applications has not been followed.**

- 7 Where appropriate, guidance will be given on making future applications.
- 8 Any approach, be it direct or indirect, by an applicant, its officers, servants, contractors, personal or professional representatives or advisers made to Members of the UK Sports Council, the UK Awards Panel or the Major Events Steering Group or its officers which, in the view of the UK Sports Council constitutes an attempt in any way to influence the outcome of the application, will at the absolute discretion of the Council render the application invalid.

### Right of Appeal

- 9 Whenever an application to the UK Sports Council is unsuccessful, the applicant has a right of appeal to an independent assessor, appointed by the UK Sports Council.
- 10 Any such appeal must be lodged with the independent assessor within 30 days of the date of the letter communicating the decision not to make a grant of Lottery or Exchequer funding.
- 11 The independent assessor may extend the time limit for lodging an appeal where he or she considers it fair to do so.

### Grounds of Appeal

- 12 An appeal against a decision can be made only on the following grounds:
- 12.1 **that the decision-making body misunderstood or failed properly to take into account relevant information; or**
- 12.2 **that the procedure for making applications was not fairly or reasonably applied; or**
- 12.3 **that the reasons given in the decision not to make a grant of Lottery or Exchequer funding do not correspond to the criteria published according to which applications are considered.**

### Appeals Process

- 13 Appeals must be in writing and addressed to the independent assessor c/o UK Sport. There is no provision for an oral hearing.
- 14 The independent assessor will determine as soon as possible whether the grounds of appeal are made out. If so, the independent assessor will remit the case back to the decision-making body for reconsideration.
- 15 The decision-making body will make the decision on the appeal and advise the appellants of the outcome with reasons in writing.



UK SPORT APPEALS PROCESS: CRITERIA FOR WORLD CLASS PERFORMANCE PROGRAMME FUNDING

A criteria that applies to all UK Sport Lottery schemes is limitation of funds. A sport could meet all or any of the priority ratings below but budgetary constraints may necessitate a different outcome to one solely based on merit.

Olympic Priority One

- **Recent performances of athletes from the discipline reflect multi Olympic medal potential in the current Olympic cycle.**
- **There is evidence of a performance system within the sport that, with support, should continue to produce a high number of athletes.**
- **Athletes from the discipline have won medals at both the last two Olympic Games (Sydney and Atlanta).**

Olympic Priority Two

- **Recent performances of athletes from the discipline reflect Olympic medal (not multi medal) potential in the current Olympic cycle.**
- **There is evidence of a performance system within the sport that, with support, should continue to produce talented athletes.**
- **Athletes from the discipline have won medals at any of the last three Olympic Games.**

Olympic Priority Three

- **Small scale World Class Performance Programmes supporting athletes.**
- **Athletes from the discipline have won medals at the most recent World/European Championships within Olympic disciplines and/or recent performance against targets reflect Olympic medal potential in the current Olympic cycle.**

Olympic Priority Four

- **Athletes with medal potential who merit tailored support.**

Paralympic Priority One

- **Swimming and track and field athletes whose recent performances reflect Paralympic medal potential in the current Olympic cycle (75% of the medals available are from these two sports).**

Paralympic Priority Two

- **Athletes from the discipline have won more than one medal (one of which must be gold) at the last Paralympic Games (Sydney) and athletes within the discipline have the potential to maintain or improve on that status in Athens 2004.**

Paralympic Priority Three

- **Athletes from the discipline have won a medal at the last Paralympic Games (Sydney) and have the potential to achieve a Gold in Athens in 2004.**

Paralympic Priority Four

- **Athletes from the discipline have the potential to win a medal in Athens 2004. (Tailored support some of which may be targeted via BPA).**

Non-Olympic Priority One

- **Small scale non-Olympic World Class Performance Programmes.**
- **Recent performances against targets reflect World Championship medal potential in significant disciplines or**
- **Evidence of Olympic preparation benefits to WCPP funded athletes.**

CRITERIA FOR WORLD CLASS EVENTS PROGRAMME FUNDING

The status of the event

The public profile of the event

Event management and support

The development of the sport, including elite performance

The wider impacts associated with the event; economic, social and cultural

The degree of international influence exerted through the event.

Financial considerations, including the affordability of contributing Lottery funding to the event in comparison with other demands on limited funds.

## Annex B

---

**UK Sport Appeals Procedures: Athletes**


---

- 16 This appeals procedure will apply in respect of Lottery funding, specifically to appeals submitted by Performance Directors against decisions delegated to UK Sport Officers in relation to the Athlete Personal Award level (A,B or C) of a nominated athlete
- 17 The right of appeal does not extend to decisions made by a Performance Director to exclude an athlete from the Performance squad or to select or de-select an athlete. In these circumstances the athlete grievance remains, as now, with the governing body.
- 18 The criteria according to which such applications are considered and the procedure for making applications are set out separately.
- 19 This appeals procedure only applies where an application made to UK Sport for Lottery funding is unsuccessful.
- 20 In the case of Athlete Personal Awards, a decision to place an athlete on a lower award level (B or C) than that proposed by the Performance Director can be considered as unsuccessful
- 21 An appeal can only be based on the information presented by the Performance Director at the time the decision is made.
- 22 Where an applicant has new information to place before the decision making body the appeal should ideally be withdrawn and a fresh application considered
- 23 It is possible for new information, which could impact on the recommendation, to become available between consideration by the Officers and the decision of the UK Awards Panel. In these instances, the application will go back for the consideration of the officers.
- 24 Whenever an application made to UK Sport for Lottery funding is unsuccessful, brief reasons will be given to the applicant explaining why the application was unsuccessful. This information will be communicated in writing to the athlete within 48 hours of the decision.
- 25 Save in exceptional circumstances an application will only be unsuccessful where:
- 25.1 **it fails to meet the criteria according to which such application is considered; and/or**
- 25.2 **the procedure for making applications has not been followed.**
- 26 If the appeal is against officer decision under delegated authority, the appeal shall be heard by an Appeal Panel of three individuals appointed by the UK Awards Panel. At least one of the Appeal Panel members will be a member of UK Sports Council. (At least one of the Appeal Panel members should be a member of the Athletes Commission or Athlete Liaison.)

- 27 If the appeal is against an application deemed unsuccessful by the UK Awards Panel, the appeal shall be heard by the UK Sports Council.
- 28 Any such appeal must be lodged with UK Sport within 30 days of the date of the letter communicating the decision not to make a grant of Lottery funding.
- 29 An appeal against a decision can be made only on the following grounds:
- 29.1 **that the decision-making body misunderstood or failed properly to take into account relevant information; or**
  - 29.2 **that the procedure for making applications was not fairly or reasonably applied; or**
  - 29.3 **that the reasons given in the decision not to make a grant of Lottery funding do not correspond to the criteria published according to which applications are considered.**
- 30 Appeals must be in writing and addressed to the Head of Lottery c/o UK Sport. There is no provision for an oral hearing.
- 31 In the case of an appeal against an officer decision, the decision of the Appeal Panel will be final. The Appeals Panel will give brief reasons in writing to the applicant and to officers explaining why the appeal was allowed or disallowed as the case may be.
- 32 Appeals will normally be heard within 28 days of the appeal being received.
- 33 Appeals against decisions delegated to UK Sport Officers in relation to the Athlete Personal Award level (A,B or C) of a nominated athlete must be submitted by the Performance Director on behalf of the athlete. In the event of a Performance Director not supporting such an appeal, the matter should be resolved within the Governing Body.