

# Minutes of the Meeting: 29<sup>th</sup> January 2004 (held at UK Sport, 40 Bernard Street)

#### **Present**

<u>Chair</u> Sue Campbell

Members Nick Bitel Adrian Metcalfe

Patrick Carter Gavin Stewart
Dr Laura McAllister Connie St Louis

**UK Sport Staff** 

Andrew Barnett Head of Communications
Liz Nicholl Acting Chief Executive

John Scott Director, International Relations and Major Events

Acting Director, Drug-Free Sport

Neil Shearer Director, Corporate Services

Observers

Roger Draper Sport England

#### Introduction

Sue Campbell welcomed members to the meeting.

#### **Apologies for Absence**

Louise Martin, Zarhara Hyde-Peters, Anne Ellis, Alastair Dempster and Eric Saunders sent their apologies as did Eamonn McCartan, Ian Robson and Huw Jones.

### Minutes of the Meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2003

- It was pointed out that there was an error with paragraph 34 as it stated that "one member" was concerned about paragraph 7 Missed Tests Policy, when in fact it concerned several members.
- The minutes of the Meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2003 were declared as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.

#### **Reform Agenda**

#### Governance Review: (UKSC 001 2004)

Sue Campbell introduced the item and explained that it was partly an update but also an opportunity for members to discuss the way UK Sport is tackling the reform agenda. The DCMS had been informed that at the end of the governance review a number of recommendations would be put to Council for members to

- ratify. These will then be formally sent to the DCMS.
- Members were informed that the first meeting was spent answering the question raised by the Secretary of State and the Minister about whether UK Sport should become an organisation that reported directly to the Sports Cabinet. That would change the UK Sports into being an agency of government rather than a non-departmental public body (NDPB). Adrianne Fresco from the Office of Public Management had facilitated the debate around which of the two options were appropriate for UK Sport.
  - The debate had concluded that that being a NDPB is for UK Sport as it provides an arms length relationship with government and does not tie UK Sport too closely to government policy.
- The second workshop was spent establishing the views of the working group on the future role of UK Sport as the structure and working methods must reflect its responsibilities. At the second session, a common view was emerging about the role of the UK Sports Council and this was shared with members by way of the business planning presentation referred to in the next item.
- Members were informed that a written report of each meeting would be circulated to all members and, if they had any concerns about the process, they should raise them. Feedback should be given to Connie St Louis, Louise Martin or Sue Campbell.
- It was noted that the third session scheduled for 16<sup>th</sup> March would focus on Governance structure and a series of recommendations would be fed back to Council members.

#### **Business Planning (UKSC 002 2004)**

- This item was introduced by Neil Shearer and Liz Nicholl. The senior management team and the consultants, Collinson Grant, were working together, managing the process and having regular meetings. The group started by reviewing UK Sport's mission and core purposes through a process which included all staff consultation. The work of the group was now focusing on objectives to support the core purposes. Then the key processes, skills and resources would need to be identified and following this a financial plan will be produced. A draft budget for 2004/2005 has been prepared and budgets for 2005-2009 have been projected forward on a status quo basis. The output of the business plan process will inform what needs to change. That will then generate the funding requirement. The timescale is to report to the Sports Cabinet for the 20<sup>th</sup> April and an additional Council date (2<sup>nd</sup> April 2004) has been proposed so that progress can be shared and allow sufficient time for member input.
- Liz Nicholl gave a presentation on the purpose and goals (see attached) explaining that Stage 1 was about identifying the unique responsibilities of UK Sport which adds value to those of the Home Country Sports Councils. After consultation with staff it was agreed to recommend "Leading sport in the UK to World Class success", which clearly pitches UK Sport responsibilities at the World Class level. It was further recommended that underpinning this statement there should be three core purposes focusing on: World Class Athletes; World Class Influence; and World Class Standards. Some of these words had been questioned at the Governance group, and the business planning group was reflecting back on the feedback. Part of the planning process would include defining what is meant by "supporting"; identifying which athletes; what is meant by success and which events are being referred to. It was suggested that the

- words "World Class Athletes" might be changed to "World Class Sport". It was noted that the planning group struggled with using the word "influence" but found it hard to find an alternative.
- The word "delivering" might be reviewed in relation to Drug-Free Sport depending on the outcome of the review, which is ongoing at this point in time. The best practice in sporting governance is where the Modernisation work is seen. Council agreed that what is needed is to make sure that those that are working with governing bodies have the right tools to influence and support them improve sporting government. The question of whether Modernisation is just about governance was raised. It was agreed that modernisation was partly about raising standards of sporting governance but also about the philosophy and ethics underpinning governance. UK Sport needed to be the organisation to which people turned to find out about world class practice. We could not advocate world class practice and standards if we could not define them ourselves.

#### **Drug Free Sport Review - Verbal Update**

John Scott notified members that PMP consultants, with the support of their team which included two academics from the Universities of Loughborough and Anglia Polytechnic, have been approached to undertake the review. A meeting has been held with the team to discuss their proposed methodology and timetable. A questionnaire is being developed to capture information and views from interested parties. A separate questionnaire is being prepared for athletes. The sports that the group are meeting with, or have met with are: football, swimming, athletics, cycling, rugby union and rugby league, rowing, judo and triathlon. Meetings have now been organised with the Minister of Sport, officials in DCMS, with relevant people in the home countries and in other key organisations. Lord Moynihan had also requested an interview. There is also a public consultation opportunity through the website where individuals can pass comment to the consultants. Completion is anticipated by the end of February, early March.

#### **Corporate Services**

#### Financial Management Report (UKSC 003 2004)

- Neil Shearer introduced this item and explained that if Members were content, a brief financial paper would be circulated on a monthly basis from the new financial year. As part of the business planning process, reviews of financial processes and procedures are being carried out. The areas which need work are: improved commitment accounting, including combining Lottery and Exchequer records; seeking to move to a single set of statutory accounts if legislation allows, the costing of drug tests; and simplifying the income and expenditure report. £3 million additional Exchequer funds had been received to cover the Lottery shortfall but a letter received this week suggests that this might not be Exchequer funding after all but Lottery funds.
- As was reported to the Sports Cabinet, a £9 million Lottery shortfall has been identified in the commitments already made for next year.
- 17 It was suggested that the costs being incurred from the reform agenda for consultancy and the costs involved in personnel and reorganisation should be taken into account. They will be built into the next monthly report. It was

confirmed that UK Sport have a £180k grant from DCMS to cover some of these costs and potentially a further grant would be available. It was noted that there was still work to be done to the reform figures and it has only recently been identified what the costs of all the different consultants working with UK Sport were. There are other issues that are still being finalised which affect these figures and there have also been discussions with DCMS. Council members asked to have more detailed information on the costs of the reviews which are as follows:

A question was asked about the pricing of drug testing. It was explained that UK Sport has one of the more expensive systems because laboratory costs in the UK are very high. That was why there was a strategy of trying to support a new lab in the market place, which will hopefully lead to lower costs. In terms of what is charged for a test, work is being carried out to establish what the true cost of a test is.

#### **Winning Athletes**

## UK Awards Panel: Recommendations from meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> December 2003 (UKSC 004 2004)

- Liz Nicholl explained that there were four awards for recommendation and an additional recommendation for advanced notice of funding to secure key Performance posts 2005-2009;
- Members endorsed the following awards that were recommended by the UK Awards Panel:
  - 21.1 UK Sport provide advance notice of WCPP funding to secure key Performance posts for the period 2005-2009
  - 21.2 The sports to benefit from advance notice comprise
    - the 10 UK-Wide One Stop Plan sports i.e. athletics (to include disability athletics), rowing, sailing, cycling, swimming (to include disability swimming and diving), canoeing, judo, equestrian, gymnastics, triathlon, and the two additional sports that are UK Sport WCPP priority two sports i.e. shooting and modern pentathlon;
  - The WCPP funding awarded in advance for key performance posts should not exceed £2 million of an anticipated annual WCPP income (before any possible top-up) of £11.25 million per annum i.e.17.8%.
    - (In June 2000 Council agreed to an advance notice commitment of £3 million of £16 million annual anticipated WCPP income i.e.18.75%);
  - officers work with the sports to identify the high risk critical posts, and then, within a total sum of up to £2 million, work with the UK Awards Panel Chairman to arrive at a priority order and an appropriate allocation of funding.

(Officers understand that support for the identified posts must be considered a top priority even if funding is significantly reduced from current levels);

This was agreed and Council Members delegated powers to agree precise terms to Gavin Stewart in his capacity as chair of the Awards Panel, which would consider the matter further.

- Members agreed the offer of WCPP funding to British Water Ski of £179,887 for the period 1 April 2004 to 31 March 2005.
- Members agreed the offer of WCPP funding to British Orienteering Federation BOF of £98,000 for the period 1 April 2004 to 31 March 2005.
- Members agreed the offer of an additional package of WCPP funding to BOF of up to £16,550 for the period 1 April 31 May 2005 in support of the GB team which will compete at the World Cup staged in the UK in May 2005.
- Members agreed the offer of a grant of up to £75,000 towards the cost of the Great Britain team competing in the 2005 Deaflympics in Melbourne, with the grant managed by the English Federation of Disability Sport.

### BOA partnership and funding for Olympic preparation camps (UKSC 005 2004)

- This item was introduced by Liz Nicholl. She explained the importance of the partnership with the BOA in terms of UK Sports core purposes and the critical nature of the shared responsibility for supporting the athletes to deliver the very best performances at the games. The relationship with the BOA had historically not been as effective as it should have been but there was now a genuine window of opportunity to define a new relationship focusing on what was best for the athletes. There was real evidence that the BOA were more prepared than ever before to come to the table and although politically relationships had at times been strained, at an officer level they have always been very good.
- Council agreed that UK Sport should proceed with the discussions aimed at creating a meaningful partnership agreement with the BOA to reflect joint interest in the best possible support and preparation for Team GB so that athletes are able to perform at their best in 2008 and 2012. Proposals would be brought back to Council at the March meeting. Subject to agreement on this, members were minded to support the proposal to fund pre-Athens holding camps up to \$800,000 but agreed that the rigour of financial need and affordability that applied to other funding decisions should also apply to the BOA. Members considered the extent to which the funding proposal should be linked to the terms of the funding agreement and, following some debate, agreed that the two elements should be linked.

### Modernisation Programme application from Sportscotland (UKSC 006 2004)

Members agreed to approve a modernisation investment of £486,000 over three years through sportscotland to support finance, HR, legal and ICT consultancy support for 21 Scottish Governing Bodies. Members agreed the application

#### **International Relations and Major Events**

## Major Events Panel: Recommendations from meeting of 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2003 (UKSC 007 2003)

John Scott introduced this item with Panel recommending two awards. The first one being the 2005 European Eventing Championships. This is the third element

of the strategy by the BEF to deliver an event in the three Olympic disciplines. Members' agreed to the 2005 European events championship with a grant of up to £275,000.

- The second event recommended was to support the 2008 Fina World Swimming Championships (25m). This is a very important event for British Swimming as it would be the largest and most significant swimming event hosted in the UK. It would require a temporary pool and the viability of this approach has been investigated by Manchester City Council and independent agencies.
- It was noted that this application was very significant as it would enable UK Sport to put on a swimming event which has never been seen before in this country and would accommodate advanced technology in solving the problem of large spectator numbers for swimming event.
- Members agreed to support the 2005 FINA World Swimming Championships (25m) with a grant of up to £950,000.
- Members noted the agreed date for the next Major Events conference as the 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2004 to be held in London.

#### **UK Sport International Strategy (UKSC 008 2004)**

37 Members agreed to adopt the UK Sport International Strategy.

#### **Personnel Item**

A confidential minute was taken for this item and was held by the Chair.

#### To agree dates of next meetings

39 Date of next meeting: Thursday 18 March 2004 – Belfast.

The following dates were proposed:

Friday 2 April – London (additional day for business planning)
Wednesday 19 May – Cardiff
Wednesday 14 July – London (brought forward for Members' convenience)

For the convenience of Members, the following dates may be brought forward:

Thursday 14 October – Loughborough Thursday 9 December – Glasgow