

Regional Sports Board

MINUTES

3rd Meeting 2004

Held on 29 April 2004 at Manchester Museum, Oxford Road, Manchester.

1 PRESENT

Board Members

Andy Worthington, Anil Ruia, Chris Carr, David Newton, Ann Hoskins, Pam Jervis, Carole Hassan, Phil Clarke, John Townsend, Colin Chaytors.

Sport England Officers

Stewart Kellett, Karen Keohane, Dave Hewson, Shileen Tarpey, Phile Shirfield, Chris Dodd, Alastair Phillips, Steve Bunyan, Julie Lane.

Guests

Tessa Wiley - NOF

2 APOLOGIES

Carole Gustafson, John Ashton

3 RESOLVED

Members agreed to:

Approve the minutes of the previous meeting as a true record.

Further point raised about level of detail in the minutes, and it was agreed that current level of detail was sufficient.

4 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

John Townsend – consulted on an Active England Project

David Newton – Projects from Cheshire



ACTION

Phil Clark – Healthworks Application

Carole Hassan – Projects from Trafford

John Bell – Projects from Knowsley

Matters arising

Investment Strategy – there is to be a meeting of the sub-group prior to the next Board meeting

Research Plan – Cultural observatory – this topic will be brought to a future meeting

Chris Carr commented/ suggested that a short report stating what the Regional Office is currently involved in should be prepared for Board meetings so that the RSB are more informed on the activities of the regional office.

RESOLVED

4.1 Officers agreed to produce a report at the next meeting.

5 REGIONAL SPORTS BOARD GOVERNANCE & DEVELOPMENT

A governance booklet has been produced by HQ which sets out the Rules of Governance for the Board.

Members were asked to highlight any points which they were unsure of.

Discussion took place regarding the work to be done beyond the RSB meetings and links to regional and sub-regional groups.

5.1 **RESOLVED**

Members agreed to abide by the rules of Governance.

Members agreed to a residential / full day meeting in the Autumn to work on development – more detail to be provided at next meeting.

6 THE NORTH WEST PLAN FOR SPORT

Discussion took place regarding the latest draft of the plan. Members requested that the title of Plan should better reflect Physical Activity.

- Supporting Role, Lead Role – agreed to remove from page 3 of the plan.
- Principles – adopt policy statement, principles need ‘beefing up’

A number of specific points were made

- Important opportunity for Government to look at realistic ways to collect data (PCT's not collecting additional data)
- Changes/actions should go through thematic groups
- Benefiting Economy – needs to link with the tourism strategy
- Education should be better linked in the Plan and not divided into (1) Primary/ Secondary (2) Post-16

The launching and promotion of the Plan needs to be addressed to different sectors and geographical areas.

6.1 **RECOMMENDATION**

Members approved the North West Plan for Sport and Physical Activity.

7 ACTIVE ENGLAND OPEN ROUND

7.1 Board members were referred to the Papers which had been circulated. Karen Keohane highlighted the following general points:

- 7.1.1 The programme comprised a 'solicited' element for which the deadline had been 9 January and from which the Board had already approved four schemes, three of which had been ratified by the National Project Board at a cost of £2.058m.
- 7.1.2 The balance of £13.8m had been subject to an 'open' round, the closing date for which had been 31 March and for which c.170 applications had been received.
- 7.1.3 It was noted that the 'solicited' scheme which had been rejected by the National Project Board (work in support of the Euro 05 Womens Chamionship) had failed on two counts – (1) that it was not multi-sport', and (2) that it was not venue specific – ie it did not specify closely enough the 'multi-activity environments' in which the activities would take place. This had important implications for a significant number of schemes received in the open round which were ineligible on one or both of these counts, despite extra regional guidance offered, and specific advice triggered by the completion of 'Intent Forms' by applicants.
- 7.1.4 The Board had agreed not to make any

geographical allocations in advance.

- 7.1.5 The Board had agreed to put a grants 'ceiling' on schemes of £1m, unless exceptional circumstances arose.
- 7.1.6 The Assessment Team was recommending 37 out of the 170 schemes for approval, 9 schemes for 'reluctant rejection', 62 schemes for rejection, and 58 schemes as ineligible. Funding adjustments were being recommended for 17 of the 37 schemes being recommended for support.
- 7.2 Board members raised a number of points relating to the comprehensive report:
 - 7.2.1 Some areas and organisations were under-represented
 - 7.2.2 Future judgements should further develop the level of risk on the investment.
 - 7.2.3 Of the schemes recommended for rejection, it was accepted that due to the time constraints, officers had not been able to provide as much information as they would have liked.
 - 7.2.4 At what stage Business Plans for schemes would be needed: it was accepted that in the attempt to make the process easier for applicants, business planning was not required at the first stage, but this could compromise viability later
 - 7.2.5 What milestones might be imposed later regarding match-funding, revenue support, security of tenure, design etc, and how these are to be agreed and developed.
 - 7.2.6 The likely conditions regarding performance measurement – particularly regarding increases in participation which had not been asked for on the application form - and clawback . Each project will require a Business Plan and will need to embrace investment conditions to help deliver the project and protect the investment.
- 7.3 Members raised the following questions about specific schemes:
 - 7.3.1 20040074 Rochdale – was £300k still unconfirmed? Yes, but officers were confident it will be forthcoming.
 - 7.3.2 20040466 Bolton Indians – budget risk score looks low – Regional office to check viability and project need via a 'site visit' before the National

Project Board meets. The cost of the sports hall element appears to be low.

- 7.3.3 20041161 Cumbria Outdoors – Keswick is not in a deprived area of Cumbria – would transport be available to bring young people in from areas of disadvantage? Yes, the scheme is Cumbria-wide.
- 7.3.4 20040940 / 20040437 Bury / Liverpool John Moores – the schemes appear to have incorrect scores on the Case Summaries. Regional Staff to check.
- 7.3.5 20041057 St Helens appears to include partnership funding from incorrect sources (Lancaster). Regional staff will amend the inaccuracy.
- 7.4 It was agreed that all the schemes should be offered grant / rejected as per the papers which had been circulated, with the following provisos:
- 7.4.1 20040466 Bolton Indians Club to be visited and checked for viability
- 7.4.2 If any changes in grant offers need to be made as a result of re-appraisal of Bolton Indians or the failure of any other scheme to meet grant conditions/ funding arrangements, then the Chair will confer with the Regional Director to agree which of the nine schemes should be elevated from the 'reluctant rejection' group, according to
- the resources available (ie apply 'best fit')
 - the scheme's ability to deliver
 - the applicability of suitable grant conditions to protect the investment
- 7.5 The Chair summed up the item by recognising the level of Board scrutiny regarding the process and thanked Board members and the Regional Staff for applying their expertise so effectively to the huge volume of applications which had been received.