



Minutes of the Management Board meeting held on 14th July 2012

Present: Jem Lawson (JL), David Rigby (DR), Lawrence Green (LG), Graeme Maw (GM), Jane Wild (JW), Duncan Hough (DH), Richard Taylor (RT), James Barton (JB), John Petrides (JP).

Apologies: none

In attendance: Mark Barfield (MB), Helen Wyeth (HW), Paul Smith (PS), Gareth Hall (GH: Minutes)

Referenced: Morgan Williams (MW), John Muddeman (JM), Samantha Rankin (SR), Simon Mills (SM), Tom Goldspink (TG), Mike Townley (MT), Derek Biggs (DB)

Item	Minutes	Owner and Due Date ¹
1	<p>Chair's welcome and introductory comments</p> <p>JL welcomed all to the meeting and thanked them for their attendance.</p> <p>JL briefly provided an update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He mentioned and distributed the new TE pin badges. These formed part of the continued efforts to promote Triathlon England. • He also mentioned the distributed Olympic tickets and looked forward to success at the upcoming events. • He finally remarked and thanked all for their continued commitment to Triathlon England. <p>Declare interest</p> <p>None declared</p> <p>Apologies</p> <p>No apologies</p>	

¹ Unless otherwise specified, all actions are due by the date of the next Board Meeting.

<p>2</p>	<p>Financial Report</p> <p>JB presented the financial reports and commented on the new method of reporting. The reasoning behind this was to make the Sport England split more obvious, highlighting membership income/expenditure. This system also serves to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show Sport England monies, profit/loss in their own right. • Provide more information on membership and how this builds throughout the year. • There is still work to do to tie all information together so all parties are working on the same set of figures. <p>JB confirmed that at the two month position we were behind against projections for both income and membership. It would seem that this is primarily down to a new pattern in how and when customers are buying their membership. This is all down to the change to rolling membership and the new profile it has created. This new profile appears to be creating a steadier stream of joining and less of the large ‘lump’ seen previously, with historic members also spreading across the year. From the June accounts it appears that the variance between projection and actual is closing but this cannot yet be seen in the submitted accounts.</p> <p>MB mentioned that in the last ten days SR has produced a report that is able to track actions of communications and promotions directly against membership figures, thus ascertaining a degree of effectiveness.</p> <p>RT asked; What was the percentage of auto-renewals, and whether this had dropped?</p> <p>It was explained that a number of people were choosing not to auto-renew and that those signing up to direct debit were also cancelling. MB also highlighted that a number were still on the card renewals and not direct debit and these haven’t fully worked their way out of the system yet. This means that a number will not be able to be renewed automatically.</p> <p>JL stated the necessity to see and understand exactly what this looks like.</p> <p>MB referred to the narrative which we can now produce to understand what triggers renewal and that we can start to understand what this actually looks like.</p> <p>JB stated that the income was down, but getting closer to the projected figures.</p>	
-----------------	--	--

<p>PS noted that membership was previously reported on a calendar year and this is now being aligned to the financial year.</p> <p>JB outlined how membership is reported and the financial effects and consequences of this.</p> <p>RT expressed the necessity to measure churn effectively and questioned what this should look like, particularly with apparent gaps in some memberships. This leads to the question of when an individual has truly lapsed and if they return are they a new member or a renewed member?</p> <p>GM questioned whether there were other sports or organisations that have gone through the process of moving to rolling membership to see what we can learn from them? This should allow us to understand better when trends might level out. He also stated that at time the board should actually be comfortable being 'grey'.</p> <p>ACTION - MB stated that he would investigate this and look at whether wider economic trends are also having an effect.</p> <p>DR noted that anecdotally race numbers are down and this would likely be having an effect on all operations.</p> <p>MB stated that a wider perspective across the country shows a mixed picture. These figures are also affected by an increase in the number of races resulting in a greater choice. The recent Sport England satisfaction figures have also shown an increase.</p> <p>JL asked whether it was too simplistic to simply report how many people have been members over the year. JB however stated that this was over simplistic and actually would give an artificially high figure, which confirmed the premise upon which JL's question had been predicated.</p> <p>JB also made note that the target for the current year was actually below that achieved by year end 11/12. He questioned whether this was bad for our reports to Sport England. MB however stated that Sport England are not interested in membership as a measure of success and that the only use of their reporting was to demonstrate retention.</p> <p>JB made note of one final point, noting the savings made on production of the members' handbook. LG questioned how this could be produced cheaper but PS suggested that this was simply down to a budget that was too high initially.</p> <p>JL asked how long Triathlon England should remain as a dormant company. RT suggested this enabled it to keep the name. However LG also suggested that the held constitution was inappropriate for purpose</p>	<p>MB</p>
---	-----------

	as it does not match what it actually is. It was agreed that this was a discussion for another time.	
3	<p>Business update</p> <p>- Strategy</p> <p>It was agreed by all that they should finally draw a line under the strategy document and that MB should take action to publish.</p> <p>MB has now completed the process of 'putting numbers in boxes'. This has meant essentially setting targets. If the board agree then these will be kept. He also noted that these figures were slightly down on those in the Sport England plan, this was due to funding for the next four years not yet being confirmed.</p> <p>RT was happy with this progress and recommended that all agree.</p> <p>GM noted that there were a few pieces requiring amendment with the input of SM.</p> <p>ACTION - GM was to complete this work by close of business Tuesday 24th July.</p> <p>ACTION - JL also asked that all final contributions and amendments sent by close of business Tuesday 24th July.</p> <p>ACTION - MB to distribute current draft immediately to all board members for their comments, to be received by close of business on Tuesday 24th July. MB will make amendments and resend by email for final approval by 27th July.</p> <p>JB asked who would see the strategy document and questioned the necessity to publish. There was a feeling that the strategy should be different for an internal audience to that required for external partners and interested parties. RT also questioned whether printing was necessary.</p> <p>ACTION- MB to publish two electronic strategy documents for the two different potential consumer groups.</p> <p>- Business Operations</p> <p>LG questioned whether there was no specific target for the growth of event numbers. MB stated that there was currently no specific target for</p>	<p>GM</p> <p>JL</p> <p>MB</p> <p>MB</p>

growth but that for the 13/17 funding period there would be.

LG also questioned that as some targets could largely be seen as the responsibility of the regions have they been consulted on this?

- Hatch PR contract

JL summarised the process by which a number of PR companies had tendered and Hatch PR were ultimately appointed. He made mention that there were a number of issues identified to him around this process which he had brought up directly with MB. MB explained to the board the process by which he had appointed Hatch PR but again apologised for not consulting board members before doing this. HW noted that this was something that could be done under delegated responsibility however, agreed that information flow could have been better.

LG questioned whether Triathlon England members were being emailed directly. It was explained that they (Hatch) did not have the database nor authority to do this. That board members were receiving information directly was as a result of TG giving them a small number of email addresses of interested parties only.

GM stated that the work they were undertaking seemed quite low level. This was conceded but was likely to be related to the level of cost involved in a greater level of activity and the budgets that had been made available for this.

LG asked why this contract had caused issues and questions from the BTF board, however JL stated that it was not their (BTF board) area to question and as such remained a Triathlon England issue and decision.

JL had given his approval for the hatch project.

- Leigh Day

Following up the action from the previous TEMB meeting LG described how they had undertaken a conference call to identify areas to consider in this matter. He described the system for members and the need for systems and safe guards in place to avoid paying in future e.g. on fictitious claims

Any progress would necessitate Leigh Day and Co to agreeing all clauses. There was considerable movement on all fronts with this but there was still no guarantee that liability was capped.

It was also left to agree with Welsh Triathlon exactly how the sinking fund was shared and to confirm that this was actually a function of British Triathlon? This would require administration time being allocated to this function in the office.

	<p>LG stated that we would also need to understand what the actual process of acceptance actually is?</p> <p>- Risk Register</p> <p>JL suggested that it was sensible and necessary to have a single British Triathlon risk register to cover all elements of the organisation(s)</p> <p>This process would be taken forward after the Olympic and involve MW, HW and PS. Risk identification and mitigation is in place and under consideration.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Governance Review</p> <p>JL apologised for not distributing notes from his conference call on this matter</p> <p>LG provided notes of powers and accountability. He noted that the position of Triathlon England as a division of BTF was highly unusual. That British Triathlon had no power to override any Triathlon England decision as long as it was operating within budget, and that there was some lack of understanding of this by some on the BTF board.</p> <p>It was agreed by all that both British and English directors needed a better understanding of the situation and that <u>MT might provide a second legal opinion on this.</u> Discussions have started around this process and further may be possible during the Olympic period.</p> <p>ACTION- This situation must be understood and outlined clearly before the next director appointments and put into the induction packs.</p> <p>ACTION - JL to distribute governance review conference call notes – immediately</p> <p>SPECIFIC QUESTIONS</p> <p>It was questioned whether the now longer chain of communications from member to board were making the process difficult and whether changes in structure would make this easier? It was generally agreed that it works but all levels should be mindful of all lines in communication for it to be effective.</p> <p>It was suggested that regions might take on board e-voting. This was extended to potentially being used for the Triathlon England board, as</p>	<p>JL</p> <p>JL</p>

	<p>being quorate was often difficult and this would avoid block voting. LG suggested that if agree this must be offered centrally for regions, etc and that it is possibly an issue requiring constitutional change.</p> <p>Should the board have a vice-chair position? JL noted this might be useful in succession planning however this process was not guaranteed; similarly somebody deeply involved in the sport may prove useful in assisting the chair. It was agreed generally that one wasn't required.</p> <p>JL brought up the revised position of English teams manager. This was a role description change only and would supersede the position currently held by GM. GM also stated that the title was a misnomer.</p> <p>ACTION - GM to investigate a more appropriate title – ASAP</p> <p>ACTION - JL to draft a new role description with the help of GM – by next meeting</p> <p>JL also noted a necessity to create a position with a specific portfolio for communications and marketing. There was discussion around whether this role might be co-opted onto the board with a view to assessing the role and making the appointment permanent. JW did not see any issues or conflict between this position and that of membership believing the one could supplement the other. It would however require careful organisation and clear roles and expectations. It was suggested that by co-opting TEMB might easier address the gender imbalance. LG stated that addressing this was a necessity rather than a general desire. He also stated that the use of co-option as a function, be this now or in the future, could prove a useful tool.</p> <p>ACTION - LG to investigate whether co-option is a possibility and whether it requires regulation change.</p> <p>JL made the case for tenure to be increased from two to four years, this would include a review of the position after the second year. This was based on expertise being lost and the difficulty of getting individuals fully up to speed in the required time. This would then bring TEMB into alignment with UK Sport guidelines in addition to proposed changes to the BTF board, and have this for a maximum of two terms. This was generally agreed upon, however LG questioned the validity of a two year review of an individual in their second term, as well as whether this was appropriate for independents as well? JL also noted that we weren't obliged to follow recommendations made by UK sport, but rather their spirit and might not feel obliged to observe the recommended maximum eight year period for an individual in a role.</p>	<p>GM</p> <p>JL</p> <p>LG</p>
--	---	-------------------------------

	<p>Sport England Self-Assessment</p> <p>The Things to Think About (TTTA) Sport England self-Assessment tool was tabled as something that was required and useful for the board. LG suggested its use would help to find gaps, not simply make current provisions look good. It would also aid in identifying gaps between BTF and Triathlon England provision.</p> <p>ACTION - MB and JL to go through TTTA self-assessment tool.</p> <p>Two actions have been recommended as a result of this;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formal annual appraisal of directors 2. Formal evaluation of the board. <p>LG questioned how we do this? JL suggested using the current appraisal mechanism for BTF directors as a model upon which to base our own, and similarly, to learn from the BTF board evaluation which would be completed by the end of 2012.</p>	MB/JL
5	<p>TE Major Events 2013</p> <p>DH made everybody aware of the bidding process for all British and English championship events and that information had been sent out and bids invited. The selection committee would be made up of DH, JM and one representative from each of the supra-regions, thus totalling five.</p> <p>JL questioned the selection of cross-duathlon over cross-triathlon. DH and MB explained this was on the grounds of uptake of cross-triathlon being low and the market as small one. Similarly the addition of cross-duathlon allowed the championship programme to extend across the year to a greater extent.</p> <p>MB made all aware that each English Championship costs in the region of £1200 - £1500. This was in addition to the £3000 - £4000 spent on equipment replenishment and renewal. This was all within budget but will require budgeting for the next financial year.</p> <p>JL made note of the festival model outlined during the BTF board meeting. He also made mention of proposed changes to the IRC for 2013 onwards. This would potentially be run in conjunction with other events and the day would include tristar events, a youth and junior super sprint and, possibly, a European Junior Cup.</p> <p>ACTION - HW to send information about festivals, etc to DH</p>	HW

	ACTION - DH to distribute information to supra-regional representatives	DH
6	<p>Council & Regional affairs</p> <p>JL stated the necessity for the Council and board to continue its progression and develop communications. LG suggested that as yet the Council was yet to confirm exactly what it wanted. Once they had this was likely to become an easier process.</p> <p>LG brought up the case of a parent abusing a referee during an event and raised the question of exactly what sanctions and powers a region has over its members and the necessity for full clarity around this issue.</p> <p>DH suggested we must be much more proactive in our approach to these issues, including having two briefings at children's events; one for competitors and one for parents/carers. MB agreed that a multi strand approach was required and could be achieved by reviewing current provision, educating officials and contact through parents and clubs.</p> <p>ACTION - JL and MB to review complaints procedure</p> <p>ACTION - MB to confirm if there is an athlete agreement in place for academy athletes</p> <p>ACTION - LG to report actions to Eastern Committee</p> <p>ACTION - DH to review proactive approach with ER&T committee</p> <p>It was agreed that the Triathlon England awards would be discussed at the next TEMB.</p> <p>ACTION - JL to confirm whose responsibility the awards would be through consultation with DB.</p> <p>LG expressed concern about the 'Event of the Year' award at the BTF awards. He wasn't sure if one home nation to one vote was proportional, nor was each home nation having only one event represented. It was suggested that having five events available to vote for, with a minimum of one being from each home nation might represent a better solution.</p> <p>DR raised the issue with regard to National Open Water Coaching Association (NOWCA) announcing a partnership with Triathlon England. MB explained this wasn't the case and action had been taken to rectify the situation and that he considered it closed.</p>	<p>MB/JL</p> <p>MB</p> <p>LG</p> <p>DH</p> <p>JL</p>

<p>7</p>	<p>BTF</p> <p>A Verbal Report was given by JL.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p>Events, Rules & Tech Update</p> <p>DH gave a brief overview of activities from the ER&T committee. This was taken as read.</p>	
<p>9</p>	<p>Performance Update</p> <p>GM presented the performance report and this was taken as read.</p> <p>He also gave some verbal additions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current work is less strategic and more practically focused as this is a period of heavy racing and training. He then gave two practical, worked examples from SM • They are expecting central coaching contracts to start from autumn. • Advanced Apprenticeship in Sporting Excellence (AASE) programme is being tendered for and will be piloted soon • They have created a ‘roadmap’ which is in its first round of auditing, providing reporting and a standard format. He asked whether the board would like this. <p>LG asked that the regional resource tab on the website be updated ASAP with information on who runs regional academies, how they are funded, etc. It was also questioned exactly who is responsible for the health and safety at academies. If it was the head coach it must be made clear to them. MB is currently reviewing H&S documentation and explained that this would be made clear to them.</p> <p>JL asked how Sports Aid can continue to help our up-and-coming athletes, noting that help had been given in the past to members of the current Olympic triathlon team and other elite performers.</p> <p>ACTION - MB would investigate the use of Sports Aid</p>	<p>MB</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Membership Update</p> <p>JW started by saying the membership sub group was now meeting on a</p>	

	<p>more regular basis and this was proving beneficial to all. They are all now working towards a position whereby all reports are synched, for ease and accuracy. They also welcomed new members from the North East and North West regions.</p> <p>The membership group is awaiting the results from the survey and Birmingham University research to determine future actions. They also suggested that in the near future they should produce an evidence based report on the production of the handbook and whether this needs to be in a hardcopy format.</p> <p>'tri-mates' was launched last month with a second stage planned for soon after the Olympic events.</p> <p>LG suggested that communications should all be sent as part of a newsletter.</p> <p>JL questioned whether the message about tri-mates had in fact gone out.</p> <p>ACTION - JW to confirm whether information about tri-mates programme has been distributed.</p>	JW
11	<p>Operations</p> <p>Taken as read</p>	
12	<p>Development</p> <p>Taken as read</p>	
13	<p>Other competent business (of which notice has been given)</p> <p>None</p>	
	<p>JL closed the meeting thanking everybody for their time and commitment and looked forward to fun and medals at the games.</p>	