



SPORT ENGLAND BOARD - MINUTES

14 December 2016

Rooms 11&12, Lower Ground Floor, 21 Bloomsbury Street, London, WC1B 3HF

Chair: Nick Bitel

Members: Debbie Jevans (DJ)
Denise Barrett-Baxendale (DBB)
Kate Bosomworth (KB)
Ian Cumming (IC)
Ian Drake (ID)
Chris Grant (CG)
Wasim Khan (WK)
Andrew Long (AL)
Karen Pickering (KP)
Charles Reed (CR)

Attendees: Jennie Price (JP) (part only)
Rona Chester (RC)
Charles Johnston (CJ)
Lisa O'Keefe (LOK)
Phil Smith (PS)
Nick Pontefract (NP)
Simon Macqueen (SM)
Paul Bickerton (PB) (item 4)
Greg Clements (GC) (items 4 & 5)
Duncan Truswell (DT) (items 4 & 5)
Stuart Armstrong (SA) (item 5)

Secretariat: Tanya van Niekerk (TvN)

WELCOME

1. Apologies were noted for Board Member David Goldstone. Board Members DBB and KB would need to leave the meeting early.
2. A number of declarations were noted with respect to agenda item 4 - NGB Investment Decisions: ID would step out for discussion of the British Cycling investment, by way of his position as Chief Executive of British Cycling; the Chair would step out for the UK Athletics and England Athletics investment, by way of his position as Chief Executive of London Marathon Events. DB would chair the meeting for this item. JP would step out for discussion of the British Fencing investment, by way of an immediate family member's former position on the Fencing management board. DBB would step out for discussion of the British Canoeing investment to avoid any perceived conflict by way of her former

position as non-Executive Director and Vice-Chairman of British Canoeing (up until July 2016). The Chair advised that WK should remain for discussion of the England and Wales Cricket Board investment as Leicestershire County Cricket Club, of which WK is Chief Executive, would not receive any funding as a result of the investment.

3. The minutes of the Board meeting held on 1 November 2016 were **APPROVED** as a correct record.
4. The Board **NOTED** the Matters Arising from the Board meeting on 20 September 2016, all of which had been completed, carried forward or dealt with elsewhere on the Board's agenda.

CEO REPORT

5. JP introduced her report.

Extension of National Trust Strategic Relationship

6. CJ presented the Extension of National Trust (NT) Strategic Relationship and Active Outdoors Programme, setting out the success of the relationship with the NT. Going forward, the programme would grow and evolve from 7 to 134 properties and engage over 1,500,000 visitors in organised activity. It would become less reliant on Sport England (SE) funding over the next four years. NT would seek to sustain the Active Outdoors Programme as one of its national membership products as part of the strategic theme of Land, Outdoors and Nature, at no cost to SE.
7. The Board **APPROVED** an increase in award to the National Trust of £874,850 in 2017/18 – 2020/21.

Terms of Reference

8. The Board **APPROVED** the Terms of Reference for the Sport England Board and for the Audit, Risk & Governance, Investment, Workforce and Chairs & Remuneration Committees.

Evaluation

9. LOK informed the Board that the results of the latest (and last) Active People Survey had been positive and had resulted in strong media coverage. LOK set out some of the key narratives coming through the national online and print articles, which included the growth in the number of women exercising and the increase in the overall number of people playing sport.
10. The Board noted that it was an excellent set of results which illustrated the impact of the This Girl Can campaign. There were however some areas where it remained difficult to increase participation, for example amongst disabled people. Concern was also expressed that the gap in participation between higher and lower socio economic groups whilst not having widened, had remained, and was substantial.

Organisational Design

11. JP updated the Board on the progress of the SE organisational design work. The focus of the work over recent weeks had been on engagement with staff. JP had held 19 sessions with 227 colleagues and had invited staff to feedback (anonymously should they wish), with 62 responses received to date. The structure and rationale for the new organisational model had been well received and was well understood. Emerging themes and suggestions included whether the organisational model was different enough, particularly with regard to thinking about local delivery areas, and ideas to help tackle the issue of silo-working - linked to an appetite to develop consistent systems and processes. The idea of working in project teams had been well received, albeit it was recognised that there would be some limits to this - the approach would need to be carefully managed and people's time would need to be ring-fenced so that project work was not grafted onto day jobs. Culturally, staff wanted to build empowerment for decisions to be made lower down the chain of command. Some concerns about the level of change needed and resultant capacity issues had been raised. In summary, the appetite for change was high and staff were positive and excited about developing a new and different way of working.
12. The Board asked about the timing of delivery of the work. It was anticipated that the overall organisational structure would be finalised by the end of the financial year, with some further development after that as the organisation evolved to support the new strategy.

Business Partnerships Update

13. The Board **NOTED** the business partnerships update.

National Lottery Promotions Unit

14. JP updated the Board on the work with the whole National Lottery family to raise awareness amongst the general public of the link between the National Lottery Brand and the projects which distributors fund with Lottery income. This work was welcomed by the Board.

Small Grants Programme

15. JP updated the Board on the way in which SE's Small Grants programme was developing to support the new strategy. Whilst SE was continuing to support traditional sports projects and the type of application typically seen through this fund, the organisation was also beginning to implement elements of its new strategic approach. Where new organisations were applying for support, or applicants wanted to use sport as a tool for social change (rather than as an end in itself), SE's grants officers were taking a proactive approach and were helping less experienced applicants to improve their bids. The Board welcomed this approach, and noted that since launching the new strategy in May, SE had made almost 400 awards through this programme.

Safeguarding Children and Young People

16. There had been significant focus in the sector recently on the issue of safeguarding children and young people in and through sport. Following a request from the Minister for Sport, SE had produced an initial report on child protection in grassroots sports. Additionally, SE was writing to all organisations in receipt of funding from SE over the next five years to

remind them of their responsibilities with regard to child protection. Internally, SE was reviewing its relevant policies to see if there were any aspects of these that should be strengthened. SE would continue to work closely with the NSPCC on this issue.

17. The Board highlighted the importance of also addressing the protection of vulnerable adults. JP confirmed that this was being considered within the work. The Board suggested that SE might like to request that the organisations which it funds identify whether they had any known historic cases of abuse, and if so, how they had managed this.
18. The Board discussed the potential risks for organisations of placing an over reliance on DBS checks. Organisations should be encouraged to regularly review their policies and procedures and recognise that the checks were just one part of a much broader approach to mitigating against this type of risk. JP confirmed that this was one of the issues which SE was looking at. Thought was also being given to how the NSPCC guidance for parents might be disseminated more widely to the organisations which SE funds and works with.
19. The Board requested a paper setting out Sport England's work in this area be brought to the next meeting.

COO REPORT

20. RC introduced her report.

Month 7 Management Account Update

21. The month 7 management accounts were included in the Board papers. RC concentrated on providing the Board with an update on the financial position of the organisation since the preparation of the report. Camelot had recently provided DCMS with a revised reforecast for the year. The SE finance team would need to work through the implications of this for the organisation, however, it was likely to mean that the cash flow projections (as previously discussed with the Board) would be at the lower end of the team's forecasts. It was noted that the SE Audit Committee had discussed a presentation recommending ways that SE could manage its lottery balances in the future and supplement the cashflow projections that were presented to the Board at its 22 November meeting. These new techniques would be adopted and included in future Board presentations.
22. The Board discussed SE's position on Lottery cost targets, noting that the expected lower Lottery income could mean that SE would exceed its current target. JP explained that DCMS was aware of and understood the impact which falling Lottery income would have on all Lottery distributors and it was anticipated that they would take account of this when assessing performance against those targets. Distributors were also discussing revised targets with DCMS which would include a target based on a rolling 3 year average income, which would be a more accurate way of monitoring efficiency where income is volatile.

Committee Minutes

23. The Board **NOTED** the minutes from the 13 September Audit, Risk and Governance Committee, 19 September Investment Committee and 1 November Chairs and Remuneration Committee meetings. The Chair advised that DG had asked that the Board

note that following the recent appointment of KPMG by the NAO as SE's external auditors, the NAO had identified a potential conflict of interest which had not arisen from their original checks and as a result KPMG had withdrawn from the SE contract for the assurance over the implementation of the new grants system.

Internal Audit Charter

24. The Board **NOTED** the Internal Audit Charter.

NGB INVESTMENT

25. PS introduced the members of his team (PB, GC and DT) who would help facilitate the session. Decisions for investment into 20 NGBs were presented to the Board for consideration. A further 5 NGBs were presented for a decision on Talent only and 2 NGBs were presented for a decision on a holding award.
26. The Board was reminded of the approach which SE had taken to the NGB investment process. PS and DT summarised the key emerging themes from the process, which included the quality of the core market and talent submissions, financial sustainability, lessons from the new approach, managing the risks, and measurement and target setting. DT observed that few sports had grasped the positive experience element; however, in the main the submissions represented a good investment and were underpinned by a good strategy. The Board noted that SE would need to continue to seek to explain to NGBs the purpose of positive experience and its role in the system.
27. PS set out the budget overview. As the Board would be approving award decisions in two separate groups (this meeting and February 2017 meeting) it was important that the investment agreed into NGBs for the December tranche did not either advantage or penalise the February group of NGBs. To avoid this, the budget had been apportioned between the two groups. The Board confirmed that it was comfortable with this approach.
28. The Board noted the importance of ensuring the right balance of funding between well developed and less well developed sports. PS reassured the Board that SE remained focused on producing a quality sporting system, with time and resources spent on helping to further establish the less well developed NGBs where this would aid SE's overall objectives.
29. The Board queried whether SE had taken account of the sports added to the 2020 Olympics in terms of overall NGB investment planning. PS confirmed that this had been taken into consideration and SE had met with three of the sports to date, however, they were still some way from meeting the governance requirements which were a pre-condition for funding.
30. The Board recognised that, for some sports, there was a certain amount of interdependency between SE and UK Sport (UKS) funding. PS confirmed that where this was the case SE had taken account of relevant UKS investment decisions and worked with

UKS to reduce the risk of any operational and financial inefficiencies arising from strategic and operational misalignment. For those sports where UKS talent funding had reduced this had meant a deferral of the recommendation to the SE Board whilst the team worked through the implications of the UKS decision with the sport. The Board was reassured that the MOU with UKS (agenda item 5a) formalised the cooperation and communication between the two organisations.

31. CR raised a general point across all of the NGB submissions with regard to the ongoing investment in and support for disabled sports people within their sport. PS reassured CR that SE had assessed each sport's ability to meet the needs of under-represented groups in their sport and the effect upon the whole of the protected characteristics had been taken account of in the methodology and scoring for each application.
32. It was noted that child protection and protection of vulnerable adults also featured strongly, with all NGBs mandated by the Code for Sports Governance to achieve the Standards for Safeguarding and Protecting Children in Sport.
33. The Board reflected on - the importance of encouraging collaborative working between sports and SE's role in advocating these good relationships; encouraging NGBs to seek out opportunities for shared services and efficiencies; and the expectation that NGBs would drive income funding by actively seeking avenues of additional funding, such as commercial revenue, philanthropy, etc. The Board was reassured that SE was taking an active role in encouraging NGBs to think about all of these aspects.
34. In addition to considering the individual investment decisions, the Board was asked to delegate authority to the Executive for the sign off of individual targets, measures and performance management procedures. The Board was reassured that no funding would be made available until SE had a fully signed off award agreement. In January 2017, relationship managers and senior members of SE would start to discuss outcome targets and KPIs with NGBs (where award decisions had been taken in December). These outcome targets and KPIs would be consistent with the approach that SE would take with other stakeholders in the core market, rather than creating a bespoke approach just for NGBs. This would maintain the 'partner neutral' approach and ensure that SE delivered line of sight across the five Outcomes shared with Government, rather than giving primacy to physical wellbeing only. Board Members supported the proposed approach to measurement and target setting, however, they felt it would help support the robustness of the process if the Investment Committee were to support the Executive by contributing to the review of the targets and measures.
35. The Board discussed the issue of line of sight for NGBs who may not necessarily know at this point in the process which of the five Outcomes their strategies would enable them to impact. PS explained that whilst the initial focus would be on impact on physical wellbeing this approach would evolve, with impact on the other outcomes developing over time as

SE and the NGBs started to understand more about what their sport could achieve. Learning would be transferable over the whole of the core market.

36. The Board agreed to **DELEGATE AUTHORITY** to the Executive for the sign off of individual targets, measures and performance management procedures. The Board agreed that it would help support the robustness of the process if the Investment Committee were to support the Executive by contributing to the review of the targets and measures.

37. The Board moved on to consider the individual NGB investment proposals.

UK Athletics and England Athletics (UKA)

38. *The Chair stepped out of the meeting. DJ chaired the meeting for discussion of this item.*

39.

[REDACTED]

40.

[REDACTED]

41.

[REDACTED]

42.

[REDACTED]

43.



44.



45.



The Chair returned to the meeting and resumed chairmanship of the proceedings.

DBB stepped out of the meeting.

British Canoeing (BC)

46. BC had a good track record in talent and had achieved all outcome targets from 2013-17. Their application clearly set out how they intend to continue to support the development of talent in a coherent, structured and aligned way to the World Class Programme. It was noted that without SE funding, future canoeing success internationally would be significantly impacted.

47. In response to a query from the Board, DT confirmed that the detailed plan included a Paralympic element and pathway and this had informed the overall scoring on the submission.

48. **The Board APPROVED a Talent Award of £3,000,000.**

DBB returned to the meeting.

British Equestrian Federation (BEF)

49. A nine month holding award for the BEF for core market delivery was recommended due to a number of areas that need developing before a full application could be submitted. The Board was reassured that SE was confident in the new leadership and would be fully involved in the consultation and development of the new BEF Strategy. BEF had a strong track record of delivery against talent objectives over the last two cycles, and had a detailed and clear plan in place for the talent and world class performance pathway.

50. The Board noted that in comparison with other sports the BEF was a relatively affluent organisation and queried whether the condition pertaining to efficiencies should therefore be strengthened to ensure a reduction over time in their reliance on public funding. PS reassured the Board that this had formed part of SE's discussions with the BEF. The award could be made conditional not only on providing details of the plan to reduce financial reliance on SE, but also on the BEF demonstrating achievement in this area.

51. The Board noted that the BEF had a good Paralympic track record, but was less successful with respect to other under-represented groups. Whilst this submission related to talent only funding, the Board would anticipate this issue being addressed as part of the application for core funding.
52. **The Board approved a total investment of £1,765,821 consisting of a 9 month Holding Award of £695,821 and a Talent Award of £1,070,000.**
53. **The Board agreed that the award condition pertaining to efficiencies should be strengthened to ensure that the BEF demonstrated how it planned to reduce its reliance on public funding over the investment period (Talent Award).**

Pentathlon GB (PGB)

54. Whilst PGB had submitted a good plan supported by a clear talent strategy, SE had identified some areas of uncertainty, for example, the evidence was not clear within the submission that the talent programme as it was presented would be successful in securing medal success at senior and Olympic level. It was noted that without SE investment into PGB's Performance Pathway programme the whole programme would be at risk. Whilst in principle SE was broadly receptive to an investment to support the UKS funded world class programme, the recommendation was to defer the decision and take the opportunity to discuss further with PGB and review the most effective vehicle for any SE talent and performance investment.
55. The Board discussed the challenges the sport faced in terms of building a talent system and whether there might be an opportunity to approach development of the talent pathway in a different way.
56. The Board agreed that there was not currently enough detail in the submission to allow Members to make a fully informed decision about the investment and agreed to defer the funding decision to the February Board meeting at which time a more detailed plan would be presented for consideration. Members noted that the sport demonstrated a strong record with regard to developing athletes involved in the sport to achieve podium or world class performance, and that PGB drew their athletes from a wide range of clubs. It was suggested that the updated plan might like to reflect on these aspects and demonstrate how PGB was thinking about fully extrapolating the related benefits.
57. **The Board agreed to DEFER an award of up to £600,000, subject to the details of the plan returning to the Board in February.**

Amateur Swimming Association (ASA)

58. Talent investment into the ASA was requested for five disciplines – swimming, disability swimming, water polo, synchronised swimming and diving. It was a complex investment with each discipline having individual talent development pathways all under the broad management of one NGB. The five independent submissions from the five disciplines had

a significant variation in the quality of information provided, with three of the five (swimming, water polo and synchronised swimming) scoring less well. The recommendation was to defer these three and proceed with the two (diving and disability swimming) that had submitted reasonably strong plans for an immediate decision and award.

59. The Board discussed the submission. It was noted that the ASA still had some work to do on the governance action plan [REDACTED] PS reassured the Board that SE would monitor this work closely and would keep the Board informed of progress against the plan.
60. In response to a query from the Board, it was confirmed that there was no risk of cross-subsidy between the five disciplines as funding was awarded to the individual disciplines, rather than the ASA.
61. **The Board agreed to DEFER the Swimming Talent Award, Synchronised Swimming Talent Award and Water Polo Talent Award investment decisions.**
62. **The Board agreed to a Talent Award of £1,600,000 consisting of an award of £850,000 to Disability Swimming and an award of £750,000 to Diving.**

GB Taekwondo (GBT)

63. GBT had a strong track record in performance and their submission reflected a reasonable understanding of the current landscape and a vision for the future direction of the organisation. GBT had clearly outlined their approach to the talent pathway for the 2017-21 period.
64. The Board noted that the recommendation included investment for back office costs. Ordinarily such costs would be funded from Core funding, however, GBT was applying for Talent funding only. DT reassured the Board that the costs were reasonable.
65. It was noted that GBT had stated that it planned to reduce its dependency on grant funding and become more efficient in terms of delivery. The Board requested that a condition be added to the award requiring that GBT agree a delivery plan for this reduction (including evidencing how they would achieve it) with SE.
66. **The Board approved a Talent Award of £1,415,000.**
67. **The Board agreed that a condition should be added to the award requiring that GBT agree a plan to reduce its dependency on grant funding with SE.**

JP left the meeting.

DBB left the meeting.

68. DT set out the rationale for the recommendation to significantly reduce the talent funding settlement for three NGBs – The Angling Trust, British Orienteering and British Waterski and Wakeboard. In all three cases it was difficult to find justification for funding the sports in terms of their strategic fit to SE outcomes. DT summarised some of the other areas of concern which had been highlighted with respect to each sport. The proposal to the Board was that SE start work immediately with each NGB to develop an exit strategy for SE funding for their talent pathway over the coming months. The exit plans would be based on 18 months of funding based on 2013-17 levels. This would be coupled with the work around each NGBs' long term sustainability to ensure a joined up approach.
69. The Board discussed the principle of exiting investing in these sports and how this would be approached. Members agreed that they were content that the three sports' talent funding should reduce to zero over the agreed period, noting some of the particular issues around no clear correlation between the talent pathway (and talent investment) and the number of people participating and the contribution to SE's strategic outcomes.

Angling Trust

70. **The Board approved a Talent Award of £51,750.**
71. **The Board agreed to DEFER the Core Market Award, the value of which was to be determined.**

British Orienteering

72. **The Board approved a Talent Award of £266,658**
73. **The Board agreed to DEFER the Core Market Award, the value of which was to be determined.**

British Waterski and Wakeboard

74. **The Board approved an investment of £1,321,184 consisting of a Core Market Award of £1,130,000 and a Talent Award of £191,184.**

British Cycling (BC)

ID stepped out of the meeting.

75. BC had submitted a high quality plan for the core market audience. They had a sophisticated segmentation model and had been able to clearly identify the customers that have a regular cycling habit and then isolate those who appear to have a less resilient habit. Their talent plan was a clear and well-presented model and provided a smooth progression through the pathway. It was noted that BC had scored slightly less well in the mass market area as they had not demonstrated as clear an understanding of that audience.

76. The Board discussed the areas of risk and challenge for BC which included - governance challenges and in particular the issue of board primacy, the importance of working with other stakeholders in the cycling market to deliver the stated goals, and the recent APS data which had shown a reduction in the number of 16-25s cycling regularly - and how BC planned to address these issues. Members noted that whilst BC had submitted a good plan, it would need to be implemented at a time of flux and change within the sport and would therefore be highly conditioned on the quality of BC's new leadership and the adoption of a strong and appropriate governance action plan. Regular reporting back to SE would be crucial and the Board asked that the condition relating to the Governance Action Plan be amended to specify this.
77. The Board noted that the application did not reference plans pertaining to diversity. PB confirmed that the prioritisation of demographic groups under-represented in the sport remained a key priority for BC. Their strategy included plans to address disability in the sport across all of their programmes, ensuring that they were inclusive enough to appeal to a diverse range of people. It was noted that female participation in the sport was also an area on which SE has asked BC to focus, as the sport was still predominately male and of a certain age group. The Board agreed that a condition should be added to the award requiring BC to deliver agreed KPIs in this area.
78. The Board discussed the importance of BC working more collaboratively with other stakeholders in the cycling market, noting that BC had taken a somewhat insular approach to this in the past. SE should be encouraging BC to explore these types of synergies. It was noted that investment into BC did not preclude SE from seeking to invest in other organisations that may be able to lead in areas where BC was doing less well, for example, women in cycling.
79. It was noted that the findings of the independent review into the culture within British Cycling's World Class Programme was due to be published later that week. This should not impact SE's decision on funding as the report was expected to focus mainly on the high performance programme, however, SE would look carefully at any relevant conclusions (for example around governance and leadership of the organisation) and address these through strengthening the award conditions, if required.
80. In response to a query from the Board, PB confirmed that the event delivery and training elements identified in BC's plan were not in competition with the market, but rather were focused on assisting the market where it could, for example helping event providers by training volunteers and setting up technical platforms which providers could use to help run their events.
81. **The Board approved an investment of £17,310,000 consisting of a Core Market Award of £7,000,000, a Talent Award of £4,620,000 and a Mass Market Award of £5,690,000.**
82. **The Board agreed the following conditions should be added to the award:**
- **BC to report to SE regularly on the progress of the Governance Action Plan**

- **Delivery of specific KPI(s) (to be determined) relating to the prioritisation of demographic groups under-represented in the sport**

Badminton England (BE)

83. BE's application had demonstrated a reasonable understanding of its customers and a clear plan to improve resilience and transition. They had identified transition routes into other sports and how this aligned with their strategy for the sport, and had shown a clear alignment between investment areas and objectives in SE's strategy.
84. The Board noted that the proposed funding was a reduction in SE investment, albeit it still represented a large investment in a relatively small participation group. The partnership with leisure providers was a significant step and a strong part of the plan, however, Members agreed that a condition relating to strengthening partnerships with other organisations who could help to deliver the plan and ensure high quality customer experience should be stipulated.
85. The Board noted that SE would review the BE talent plan as a result of UKS's decision on performance investment, and as such agreed to defer the decision on the talent award element.
86. **The Board approved a Core Market Award of £7,250,000.**
87. **The Board agreed to DEFER the decision on the Talent Award of £2,400,000, pending SE's review of the impact of UKS decision regarding performance investment in BE.**
88. **The Board agreed that a condition should be added to the award requiring BE to seek to strengthen partnerships with other organisations who could help deliver their strategy and ensure high quality customer experience.**

England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB)

89. The ECB had demonstrated an excellent understanding of their customers and shown a clear alignment between investment areas and objectives in SE's strategy. Targeted insight had been provided against each customer group and a clear line of sight was in place between customer needs and planned interventions. The plan for talent was clear and well presented, with plans to increase the size of the talent pool.
90. The Board noted that whilst the ECB's work with South Asian communities had in the past not been well developed, the organisation now had a good plan for this which offered a unique opportunity to reach this audience at scale and provide a good return against wider government outcomes. The Board was reassured that inclusion featured strongly in the ECB submission, with a well-developed plan to engage women and girls. The Board was further reassured that the plan for talent included a strong focus on disability.
91. The Board reflected on the challenge for the ECB of reaching the South Asian audience at scale and it was suggested that this would be good opportunity to look at how the more

formal parts of the cricketing system linked with the more local, non-traditional way people participated in the sport, for example, playing in parks etc.

92. **The Board approved an investment of £7,600,000 - Core Market Award of £6,560,000 and Talent Award of £1,040,000.**
93. **The Board agreed a condition should be added to the Talent Award requiring the delivery of a specific KPI (to be determined) addressing women's participation.**

England Hockey Board (EH)

94. EH had submitted a strong application developed from the insight work they had commissioned over the past four years. They had clearly demonstrated the improvements which would be made during the cycle to strengthen the resilience of its players in the core market and identified transition routes into other sports. EH was investing a significant amount of money itself to support the delivery of activities to the core market.
95. The Board discussed EH's ambition to increase its influence in the hockey market and grow participation by 7%. Members agreed that EH was currently in a good position to drive growth in the sport, particularly amongst women, by capitalising on the growing popularity of the sport and questioned therefore whether the target was stretching enough. Further, the Board expressed some concern as to whether EH was doing enough to address issues of diversity and under-representation in their sport.
96. The Board noted that the cost of delivering the model appeared to be quite high. Members were reassured that the costings had been fully interrogated by SE. EH's focus going forward would be on building a strong infrastructure, further developing the clubs to become independently financially stable and thus reducing costs to EH. The Board recognised that the support which EH gave to the clubs was significant and they had already successfully developed some of the clubs to become self-sustaining.
97. The Board agreed that SE should encourage EH to develop a more ambitious programme. In addition, EH should seek to improve their plans to address the issues of diversity and under-representation in the sport.
98. **The Board approved an award of £9,030,000 consisting of a Core Market Award of £7,000,000 and a Talent Award of £2,030,000.**

Exercise, Movement and Dance Partnership (EMDP)

99. EMDP had provided a good submission that detailed four programmes to deliver across each area of the behaviour change model and one specific programme that was directly aligned to inactivity only. Their track record in delivering against their Strategic Outcomes for 2013-17 which pertained to growing the sphere of influence over key market providers was strong.
100. The Board noted that this was a fast moving and highly commercial market that SE did not currently understand as well as it would like to. The proposed investment was a relatively

small award whilst SE continued to develop its insight and understanding of the sport and knowledge of where the market was going.

101. The Board highlighted the importance of the EMDP focusing on instructor support and ensuring its teacher-training programmes aligned with what SE was trying to achieve in the areas of coaching and support.
102. **The Board approved an investment of £1,763,893 consisting of a Core Market Award of £718,624, a Mass Market Award of £597,297 and an Inactivity Award of £447,972.**

British Gymnastics (BG)

103. BG had submitted a good application with a strong focus on attracting and retaining its core market customers by way of programmes that met their needs as well as offering positive sporting experiences. It was noted that more work was needed to develop the area of transitioning core market customers to other sports over time. This risk would be mitigated through a special condition of the award to ensure SE was satisfied with BG's approach by the end of the 2017-18 financial year.
104. The Board highlighted the importance for SE of ensuring any learnings related to transitioning core market customers to other sports were shared with other NGBs.
105. The Board agreed it was important that BG demonstrate how it planned to reduce its reliance on SE funding over time and asked that this be added to the award conditions.
106. **The Board approved an investment of £8,333,000 consisting of a Core Market Award of £6,833,000 and a Talent Award of £1,500,000.**
107. **The Board agreed a condition should be added to the investment requiring BG to demonstrate how it planned to reduce its reliance on SE funding over the funding period.**

British Weight Lifting (BWL)

108. BWL had submitted a good application which addressed the issues affecting regular customers that had been identified through a variety of sources of insight. Prioritising sustainability and reducing dependency on public investment was a key focus for BWL. There was a good link between the core market and talent proposal and BWL had a strong track record for talent having achieved all targets that were set for them in the previous cycle.
109. As had been the case with the Exercise, Movement and Dance submission, the Board highlighted the importance of focusing on instructor support and ensuring alignment of teacher-training programmes with what SE was trying to achieve in the areas of coaching and support.
110. **The Board approved a Core Market Award of £2,200,000. The Board agreed to defer the Talent Award decision due to a dependency with UKS's funding decision.**

Bowls Development Alliance (BDA)

111. The BDA had produced a good application which demonstrated an understanding of the challenges that their customers face. SE had identified facilities as a key risk to the sport and as such was particularly supportive of the intervention to improve the sustainability of clubs.
112. The Board noted that there was a large proportion of people who bowled outside of the organisation and SE was therefore encouraging the BDA to be more strategic in its approach to take account of that wider participant group. The Board agreed the BDA should be encouraged to focus on opportunities in the commercial market to help it become less reliant on SE funding in the future.
113. In response to a query from the Board as to how SE was supporting other sports to deliver to the older demographic, MD explained that if it was a new area of work, applicants would be directed to the active ageing fund. If it was existing work it would form part of the core market investment.
114. **The Board approved a Core Market Award of £1,628,512.**
115. **The Board agreed a condition should be added to the award requiring the BDA to demonstrate how it planned to reduce its reliance on SE funding over the funding period.**

British Triathlon (BT)

116. BT's submission demonstrated a good understanding of its participants and their entry points to the sport. The organisation had a strong track record of delivery and achieving targets, as well as a proven track record of partnership working. The plan had scored well in all areas of assessment and had provided a range of opportunities for SE across a range of outcomes.
117. The Board considered how SE defined 'mass market' in terms of the number of participants, citing the relatively low participation numbers in the GoTri programme. PB said that this was an activity which could appeal to broad numbers of people and based on trajectories and trends SE anticipated growing take-up of the sport. It was recognised however that whilst large scale triathlons were doing well, smaller scale events were doing less well. The Board would value more information on the mass market element should BT return for further funding in this area (following the initial 1 year award).
118. **The Board approved an investment of £5,581,154 consisting of a Core Market Award of £3,000,000, a Talent Award of £2,043,979 and Mass Market Award of £537,175.**

Table Tennis England (TTE)

119. TTE was going through a significant bottom up planning exercise across both core and mass market interventions which would be presented to the Board for decision in February. As such, a short term investment had been requested to support the Ping! programme for 2017/18. This would allow the NGB to begin planning for the summer delivery period which

would not be possible with a decision in February. The intervention had been supported through the NGB in the current cycle and had a strong track record of engaging large numbers of customers in recreational table tennis opportunities.

120. The Board approved a Mass Market Award of £250,000.

English Lacrosse Association (ELA)

121. ELA had outlined clear plans for how the interventions planned for the core offer would be delivered. They had also provided a clear justification for an improved club competition structure and the need to have a Lacrosse offer that could be played throughout the year.

122. The Board recognised that this was an investment into a non-Olympic sport, presented on the basis of the upcoming World Lacrosse Festival in 2017. Members supported the investment on the basis of the international games, however, it was agreed that it should be made clear to the ELA that this would be the last cycle of SE investment in the talent pathway.

123. The Board noted the relatively high cost per head of funding this sport and agreed that the ELA would need to demonstrate how it planned to reduce its reliance on public funding in the future.

124. The Board approved an investment of £2,813,700 consisting of a Core Market Award of £2,400,000 and a Talent Award of £413,700.

125. The Board agreed a condition should be added to the investment requiring the ELA to demonstrate how it planned to reduce its reliance on public funding over the funding period.

Rounders England (RE)

126. RE's plan was in line with what was solicited following the scoping process and represented a change in focus for the organisation, ensuring a high level of customer service would be provided to sustain the increased levels of participants following a successful growth in the sport during 2013/17, however, it was noted that the proposals required some further development in some areas.

127. The Board discussed the submission noting that whilst it was less strong in comparison to other NGB submissions, there were some good demonstrable examples of the sports success in terms of its positive impact on health and wellbeing, including mental health. Members highlighted the importance of ensuring strong measurement and evaluation was applied to the pilot project in order to ensure its success could be evidenced.

128. The Board approved an investment of £1,425,000 consisting of a Core Market Award of £1,375,000 and an Inactivity Award of £50,000.

Boccia England (BE)

129. From a Core Market perspective BE had provided a clear and concise submission with insight led interventions aimed at addressing the key areas identified in the scoping process, however, they had scored less well in terms of their inactivity and talent proposals.
130. The Board noted that the talent score had been low, however, Members agreed that overall it was still an investable proposition and anticipated that the new CEO would be instrumental in steering the organisation to success. BE had set itself a target of reducing its reliance on public funding by 13% over the four year investment period. This would be challenging but BE had already had some success in this area, having secured funding for its schools based programme. Savings would also be made in back office costs by looking at buying in services and sharing accommodation. Members recognised that whilst the sport served a relatively small audience it was a sport where people with the most limiting abilities could take part and therefore served an important target market for SE.
131. **The Board approved an investment of £1,500,000 consisting of a Core Market Award of £1,000,000, a Talent Award of £350,000 and an Inactivity Award of £150,000.**

British Fencing (BF)

132. BF had clearly demonstrated that it had an understanding of its market through conducting significant levels of consultation and building up profiles of their customers. The inactivity outcome represented a good project, but did not evidence that the intervention enabled inactive people to build a regular habit. As the customer base represented a target market for SE it was recommended that this element was supported from the core market investment, with an emphasis placed on learning and sustainability.
133. The Board noted that the sport offered SE the ability to engage with a different audience who were not typically attracted by more traditional sporting offers.
134. The Board reflected on the challenges for the organisation as a result of UKS's decision not to invest in the sport going forward. SE would need to encourage BF towards further greater efficiency.
135. **The Board approved a Core Market Award of £1,700,000. The Board agreed to defer the Talent Award decision due to a dependency with UKS's funding decision.**
136. **The Board agreed the condition relating to efficiencies should be reworded to specifically require that BF consider efficiency savings relating to its location.**

Goalball UK (GBUK)

137. GUK had submitted a good application that aligned clearly to the areas that they were solicited to apply for at the conclusion of the scoping stage. The core market plan set out clear interventions that specifically addressed the needs and demands of their existing players, however, it was noted that there were some areas which required additional development. They had scored slightly lower in terms of inactivity as the organisation was

less clear on its impact in this area in the last cycle, however, that was understandable given the focus was on overall growth not inactive participants.

138. The Board supported the investment, noting that Goalball had the opportunity to be a very inclusive sport.
139. **The Board agreed an investment of £1,284,465 consisting of a Core Market Award of £1,084,465 and an Inactivity Award of £200,000.**

British Shooting (BS)

140. BS had shown a good understanding of their market, including the barriers to participation. Their talent plan was clear and well presented, integrating the numerous different disciplines and having a good track record of delivery, however, it was noted that they had a challenge integrating the DSGB pathway into their current non-disabled provision.
141. The Board highlighted the importance of SE encouraging BS to reduce its reliance on SE funding in the future and suggested that the organisation could look more closely at partnership opportunities. It was noted that BS had made some efficiencies with regard to back office costs and direct membership opportunities were being explored.
142. **The Board agreed an investment of £1,290,000 consisting of a Core Market Award of £700,000 and a Talent Award of £590,000.**
143. **The Board agreed a condition should be added to the investment requiring BS to demonstrate how it planned to reduce its reliance on SE funding over the funding period.**

GB Wheelchair Ruby (GBWR)

144. GBWR had submitted a good application which demonstrated that they understood their customers' needs. The interventions within the plan were insight led and demonstrated clear achievable objectives. Their talent model was clearly outlined and the interventions planned should show continued development in this area.
145. In response to a query from the Board, DT said that whilst the RFU supported GBWR that support was somewhat limited (e.g. providing office space to support back office costs). The Board suggested that the SE Executive should pursue discussions with the RFU encouraging them to consider how they might further support GBWR within the wider context of funding the sport as a whole.
146. **The Board approved a Core Market Award of £1,450,000. The Board agreed to defer the Talent Award decision due to a dependency with UKS's funding decision.**

British Wrestling Association (BWA)

147. The BWA had provided a clear and concise submission with insight led interventions aimed at addressing key challenges in their core market. The talent pathway was clear with detailed interventions and structures in place at each level.

148. **The Board approved an investment of £953,302 consisting of a Core Market Award of £790,000 and a Talent Award of £163,302.**

INVESTMENT PROGRAMME – CORE MARKET

MOU with UK Sport regarding Talent and Performance Foundations

149. PS introduced the paper.
150. The triennial review of the functions of UKS and SE conducted during 2015 made a series of recommendations about securing more effective joint working between the two organisations and committed both organisations to agreeing an MOU. The MOU formalised cooperation and communication between the two organisations and reduced the risk of operational and financial inefficiencies arising from strategic and operational misalignment with UKS.
151. The Board noted that the working relationship between the two organisations had continued to develop well over the last year or more and this document formalised what was essentially already working practice.
152. A minor drafting error was noted at paragraphs 29 and 30 – the text should appear as a single paragraph.
153. In response to a query from the Board, PS said that SE and UKS may choose to adopt additional MOUs in other areas of collaboration in the future.
154. **The Board APPROVED the MOU, subject to the minor drafting amendment identified.**

Sportscoach UK Funding 2017-19 (scUK)

155. PS introduced the paper.
156. The proposal had been considered by the SE Workforce Committee at their meeting of 28 October and had been the subject of a SE peer review. DJ outlined the key points of discussion raised at the meeting. The organisation had undertaken a complete review of the skills required to deliver on SE's Coaching Plan for England which had resulted in change at all levels of the organisation including the Board and CEO. There had been a degree of nervousness amongst Committee members as scUK was currently the only national coaching organisation in the UK and as a consequence there were no other organisations which SE could consider comparatively. The Committee had agreed to recommend to the Board that it approve £2,200,000 funding per annum for two years, with the second year of funding in principle and subject to further Committee and Board scrutiny.

157. 

- [REDACTED]
158. The Board discussed the proposal noting that scUK had demonstrated positive changes to date. Members recognised, however, that scUK still had a significant amount of work to do to deliver elements of the Coaching Plan and the Board therefore supported the proposal to make the year two funding subject to further scrutiny and scUK meeting a series of SMART requirements (as stipulated in the paper).
159. The Board discussed the proposed level of SE investment, noting that UKS had recently agreed to reduce its investment into scUK. Members noted that without the support that could be provided by scUK there was a high risk that the aspirations and objectives of the Coaching Plan would not be achieved.
160. **The Board AGREED an award to scUK for £2,200,000 funding for 2017-18, with an in-principle award for 2018-19 of £2,200,000 subject to the further Board scrutiny and scUK meeting the SMART conditions.**

Supporting Sport's Core Market

161. SMQ presented the paper.
162. The Board discussed the key challenge for SE of improving resilience in the market - supporting people experiencing major life events and also those from under-represented groups who had practical barriers to keeping engaged in sport - and how SE was proposing to do this.
163. In response to a query from the Board, SMQ confirmed that SE was still working to define the age bracket of the younger age group in the core market. The current analysis was based on age 14 and up. More insight work was needed on the below 14 age group, which entailed a very different set of variables.
164. The Board had previously approved £24 million to invest into the Core Market, outside of the current 46 funded NGBs. It was proposed to invest up to £10 million across a range of partners through an open application process (phase 1), with the allocation of the remaining £14 million to be determined in 2017. The Board was supportive of launching an open fund, however, it was difficult for Members to understand the broader portfolio of investment across the whole £24m as it was not yet clear what the targets for the open fund would be, nor did SE have a sense of how the second tranche of money would be used.
165. Given the unknowns around the targets for the open fund and what the broader portfolio of investment might look like, the Board agreed that it was sensible to maintain some flexibility with regard to the amount of funding invested in the first phase. Members suggested that further work was needed to understand the appetite in the market for this type of investment as this would help to determine the right level of investment.

166. The Board **NOTED** what SE was seeking to achieve through the Core Market investment programme.

167. The Board **APPROVED** the parameters, structure and timing of the specific funding programme.

AOB

168. No items of business were raised.

The meeting closed at 4.30pm.