



## **BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

### **CONFIDENTIAL**

**17<sup>th</sup> December 2019**

De Vere Orchard Hotel, Beeston Ln, Nottingham NG7 2RJ

#### **Present:**

John Steele, Chairman  
Nigel Walker, Director  
Jamie Skiggs, Director  
Sir David Tanner, Director  
Vic Luck, Director  
Matt Rogan, Director  
Emma Boggis, Director  
Annie Panter, Director  
Ken Van Someren, Director

#### **Attending:**

Jaqui Perryer, EIS  
Peter Elliott, EIS  
Rod Jaques, EIS  
Matt Parker, EIS  
Craig Ranson, EIS  
Kevin Currell, EIS  
Tash Carpenter, EIS  
Michael Bourne, UKS  
Katherine Grainger, UKS

#### **Apologies:**

Vicki Aggar, Director  
Chelsea Warr, Director  
Andy Parkinson, Director  
Frankie Carter-Kelly, Observer

**Minutes:** Michelle Gazzana

1	General	Action
1.1	<b>Chair's Welcome</b>	
	<p>The Chair, John Steele (JS) welcomed the board to the board meeting and informed the board that Katherine Grainger (KG) and Michael Bourne (MB) were attending as observers. He also welcomed new board member Emma Boggis (EB) and confirmed the appointment of the other new member Andy Parkinson (AP), and observer Frankie Carter-Kelly (FCK).</p>	
1.2	<b>Apologies</b>	
	<p>Andy Parkinson (AP), Frankie Carter-Kelly (FCK), Chelsea Warr (CW) and Vicki Aggar (VA) had sent their apologies.</p>	
1.3	<b>Conflicts of Interest</b>	
	<p>Emma Boggis (EB) registered her interests including being a Non-executive member of the British Paralympic Association board.</p>	
1.4	<b>Minutes of the last meeting</b>	
	<p>The minutes of the last meeting were declared to be correct.</p>	
1.5	<b>Matter's Arising – summary of actions</b>	
	<p>The issue of the reduction in capital funding from Sport England remained ongoing and would do so until a satisfactory outcome. KG acknowledged this point.</p>	
	<p>Nigel Walker (NW) informed the board that the potential name change had been taken to HPSAG and had been signed off in June 2019. NW concluded that the EIS would submit their strategy for Paris 2024 to UK Sport under the EIS' new name.</p>	
	<p>JS acknowledged the importance of the EIS' presence and site branding and stated that this would be a matter to work on beyond Paris.</p>	
1.6	<b>Chair's Update</b>	
	<p>JS welcomed KG to the board meeting and asked if she could provide the EIS with an update on UK Sport.</p>	
	<p>KG thanked JS and the board for their welcome and informed the board of the current period of change at UK Sport since Sally Munday's (SM) appointment in September 2019. KG added that SM was in the process of strengthening relationships between the organisation and the sports.</p>	
	<p>KG informed the board that two long-serving board members had stepped down from their positions on the UK Sport board and that UK Sport had been in the process of recruiting two more board members, which had been deferred due to the recent general election.</p>	

KG concluded by adding that she felt positive in the recent change in government and what it would mean for High Performance sport in the lead up to Tokyo 2020.

## **2 Financial**

### **2.1 Financial update**

JSk informed the board that the EIS continued to grow their practitioner base meaning this would cause added pressure on the EIS' finances given the current charging structure.

JSk brought to the board's attention the shortfall in vacancy assumptions and of the position that the EIS would find themselves in, in the area of vacancies at year-end. JSk assured the board that compensating factors had been put in place to offset this to bring the budget to a break-even at year-end and that every vacancy underwent a process of scrutiny by the Senior Leadership Team on a monthly basis.

JSk informed the board of the YTD underspend in the Learning and Development budget and added that there was significant spend throughout the remainder of the financial year in this area, much of which was already committed.

JSk revisited the ongoing potential pension increase contribution and stated that it was one to highlight as a risk. JSk added that the outcome of this would be brought to board in March 2020 when the outcome would be known.

A full budget for the final year of the cycle would be brought to the next meeting for approval. The risk around fewer vacancies than planned was noted. Board questioned the risk and asked if there were parameters set in place, to which NW assured board that he and JSk were in regular conversation over the risks involved and would inform board ahead of March if the situation declined.

**Action JSk**

JSk highlighted how tight year 4 of the Performance Innovation budget was. In response, DT asked that board be kept updated at the next board meeting.

**Action JSK**

### **2.2 Commercial Activity**

Tash Carpenter (TC) informed the board of the current commercial activity throughout the organisation since the board last met. TC stated that commercialisation remained challenging, but some momentum had been built up and added that a partnership deal had recently been confirmed; and that two nutrition endorsements were in the latter stages of being confirmed.

TC presented three options to the board and added that she was seeking direction on the long-term position of commercialisation within the EIS

in order to write the strategy for the next cycle and referred to the accompanying paper in Appendix 13 of the board pack.

TC outlined the 3 proposed options for board to consider. They were:

1. Doing the basics better, which would mean a move backwards but would ensure that the EIS' undertakings were legal, ethical and would make best efforts to protect IP.
2. Exploring immediate opportunity and ensuring future protection. This would be all of option 1 plus a more deliberate focus on natural strengths.
3. Proactive commercialisation, which would mean a far more aggressive approach to what the EIS had done in the past and would require a separate commercialisation team.

The board favoured option 2 but asked that it be future proofed and for the budget to be assessed in greater detail.

It was decided that a more detailed outline of this proposal would be brought back to board in March 2020. **Action TC**

### **3 Governance**

#### **3.1 Risk Register & Assurance Map**

JSk advised that no significant changes had been made to the risk register since the last meeting.

JSk added that the EIS' position with Nike branded kit was not added as a risk as the EIS was not sponsored by the brand nor did it have any significant association with the brand.

The board suggested that TC look into a more proactive procurement process to align more with the EIS' values should the EIS associate themselves with brands in the future.

JSk presented the Risk Assurance Map to the board and informed them that the map had been used by the EIS' new internal auditors as a way to assess the levels of control to mitigate each risk.

JSk informed the board that there were no risks with a red assurance rating at present and that the 3 ambers on the register were in relation to the following:

- Pension
- Recruiting and retaining the best employees
- Impact of the UK leaving the EU

JSk assured the board that the EIS were looking at their strategy for the Paris cycle to mitigate the first two risks and the overall risk of leaving the EU was thought to be low for the EIS.

The board discussed 'recruiting and retaining the best employees' and questioned if there had been work done around IP, adding that this was a different risk that needed to be acknowledged. Jaqui Perryer (JP) informed the board of the recent work that had been done around the EIS' new Conflicts of Interest Policy to which the board added that recommendations and actions with UK Sport to tighten up covenants would be beneficial to the EIS.

**Action JP**

### **3.2 GARC Update**

Vic Luck (VL) updated the board of the recent cyber security presentation from the National Cyber Security Centre, which scrutinised the EIS' risks and added that there were to be a programme in place and additional work to do to secure accreditation on certain cyber issues. VL stated that this was an area in which the EIS required a certain skillset and that when it came to looking at the next cycle's strategy, data and analytics would be an area in which the EIS would need to look more closely at.

VL added that the EIS have GDPR in focus and an update would be brought to the March GARC meeting. In addition, a board member would need to be identified as a point of escalation for the data protection officer.

VL informed the board of the discussion about the financial reserves policy for UK Sport and that the conclusion drawn was that the EIS should consider creating its own reserves by putting aside a sum from its next award.

**Action JSk**

### **3.3 Approvals**

JSk presented the following for approval by board:

- VL's role as board representative to the Group Audit and Risk Committee
- Board Terms of Reference update – a change to 12 board members
- Board Code of Conduct update

The board agreed that the above were approved.

### **3.4 Remuneration Committee update**

VL informed the board that the Remuneration & Nomination Committee had met on the 29<sup>th</sup> November and added that the Board Skills Matrix would be revisited in more depth once the EIS' Paris strategy had been submitted. This was to ensure the board had appropriate expertise based upon the EIS strategy.

JP stated that the board effectiveness proposal from the Sport Recreation Alliance had been explored and that it was probable it would be carried out as a learning day in conjunction with June 2020 board.

JP added that the EIS' Senior Leadership Team had undergone work on diversity, outlined in the accompanying Remuneration & Nomination

Committee board paper, however, it was still exploring what the EIS as an organisation could address incrementally to improve its diversity.

The board suggested that the EIS engage its sporting partners on how to address ethnicity and should engage with Sally Bolton (SB) at UK Sport when decided.

## **4 Strategy**

### **4.1 National Director Update & Mission Control Report**

NW informed the board that the employment tribunal with Taekwondo had been settled and that Taekwondo would be required to reach a settlement with the complainant.

NW added that the day set aside for Mission Control had been utilised as a Paris Planning day where the independents were invited to comment on aspects of the individual strategy plans.

### **4.2 Reward and Recognition**

JP presented to the board work undertaken as part of the Reward & Recognition review and outlined the objectives and principles involved and asked for the board's view on the following 3 options:

- Option 1: Implement recommendations across the board at 100% of market median pay.
- Option 2: Implement recommendations across the board at 95% of market median pay.
- Option 3: Implement an approach to match changes in pay levels to the question of turnover/attraction where the EIS most need it. Specifically, to consider level 1 and 2 practitioner roles as a training grade for the first 4 years.

JP added that other pay factors would need to be considered, such as annual cost of living increase and other salary payments.

The board favoured option 2 but requested visibility over the break-even position and for JP to bring back further costing to March board. The board thanked JP for her on-going work around the Reward and Recognition piece.

**Action JP**

### **4.3 Individual Director Update**

Craig Ranson (CR) informed the board of the PDMS roll out to Super League Netball and added that James Bell (JB), Head of Mental Health, had resigned from UK Sport and that a proposal with funding would be going to UK Sport for a replacement through until the end of the cycle. CR concluded with an update on Respiratory Health and The Female Athlete.



Matt Parker (MP) informed the board that from now until Tokyo 2020 was the key delivery phase for Performance Innovation and touched on the projects placed in sports, including those remaining from now until Tokyo.

Kevin Currell (KC) provided an update on Project Theta and informed the board of all funded Paralympic sports that had been engaged through the project. KC stated that MP, CR and himself were in regular contact with the BOA around heat, humidity and travel in the lead up to Tokyo.

JP informed the board that the EIS were recruiting a new Head of Learning and Development and added that the EIS had recently run their annual anomalies process in November. JP concluded by stating that recruitment training sessions had been rolled out across the organisation with positive feedback from all staff.

TC referred to the Communications Report provided in the board pack and reminded board of the recent trial with a digital agency. TC confirmed that this work had developed well and that the EIS would continue to use their services with another review to take place post-games.

Peter Elliott (PE) informed the board that a significant piece of work around the multi-sport review in conjunction with the review on the IRU. PE added that the EIS site, Holme Pierrepont, had an extension approved with work to start in the new year, and concluded by informing the board of Birmingham City Council's plans for the current Birmingham EIS site during the Commonwealth Games.

Rod Jaques (RJ) updated the board on the ongoing good medical governance process and informed the board of the work underway around concussion management.

JS acknowledged RJ's ongoing work around good medical governance and thanked him for his exceptional efforts.

On behalf of the board JS commended the Senior Leadership Team's constant hard work towards Tokyo whilst managing their Paris Strategy submission in parallel.

#### **4.4 HoPS Evaluation Update**

Stuart Pickering (SP) joined board and presented Phase II of the HoPS evaluation, which provided board with an overview of the level of engagement and speed of response by the HoPS. SP stated that 12 PDs, 12 Senior coaches, 15 HoPS and 43 practitioners had taken part in the evaluation made up of face to face interviews, online questionnaires and both online and over the phone interviews.

SP identified that through this method of qualitative research, the HoPS role was seen as critical within the system.

The board stated that they were assured of the direction of travel regarding the HoPS and of the positive impact on the system to date. Further, it agreed with the suggested recommendations and stressed the need for these to be implemented. SP was thanked for his work on the review.

#### **4.5 Charging Structure**

JSk revisited the March 2019 board meeting where Neil Page (NP) presented to the board the history of the Charging Structure. JSk added that since then, a working group made up of individuals from the EIS and UK Sport had met and from those meetings came what was currently being presented to the board. UK Sport board approved the proposal in their December meeting.

The board approved the option being presented to them. Namely, option 2 and added that this should be presented to the PD Forum in January. The board also stated that thought should be given as to how the message was delivered to the wider system to ensure the clarity of the message.

#### **5 AOB**

JS thanked Annie Panter (AP) for her time on the board following her resignation as non-executive director.

DT expressed his thoughts on the UK Sport PLx Conference and added that he would like to see nominations from the EIS in next year's conference.

Ken Van Someren (KVS) informed the board that the Technical Steering Panel were seeking core people for science, medical, technology and welfare and that this would be taking place in the new year. He added that he had been working closely with HR on this.

The board asked that KVS provide an update on this during the March board.

**Action  
KVS**