



Minutes of the Management Board meeting held at 17 March 2012 at Millfield School

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

Apologies: Richard Taylor (RT)

In attendance: Lucy O’Gorman (LOG, Minutes); Mark Barfield (MB); Helen Wyeth (HW).

Referenced: Sarah Springman (SMS); Zarah Hyde Peters (ZHP); Simon Mills (SM); Ryan Wilkinson (RW); Ian Braid (IB); Paul Moss (PM); Brown Ferguson (BF), James Brown (JBW); Giles O’Brien (GOB); Sam Rankin (SR); Morgan Williams (MW); Francis Riley (FR); Claire Chapman (CC).

Item	Minutes	Owner and Due Date ¹
1	<p>Chair’s welcome and introductory comments</p> <p>10:13</p> <p>JL welcomed those present to the meeting and expressed thanks to Graeme Maw (GM) for providing the facilities and to HW for attending.</p> <p>JL reported that the BTF is undergoing a governance review and considering changes in structure after 2012. JL suggested that TEMB should consider this during our meeting and it will be taken as the first item after the lunch break.</p>	
2	<p>Strategy, interim position</p> <p>Strategy Statement</p> <p>MB gave a summary of the strategy document and a two page synopsis. MB confirmed that feedback from Sport England (SE) will be received on Thursday 22nd March and will get an idea on figures.</p> <p>Action: All comments about the strategy so far to be sent to MB</p>	All

¹ Unless otherwise specified, all actions are due by the date of the next Board Meeting (Section 12).

	<p>LG noted that the reserves policy may need adjusting if the figures are increased. MB confirmed it is not the complete submission until the agreement is signed by MB, but Sport England want to start allocating figures.</p> <p>Communication strategy</p> <p>MB confirmed that the communication strategy will follow the strategy statement and the Sport England will influence its development. However, other work can proceed, such as email protocol as part of the communication strategy.</p> <p>Action: MB to keep TEMB updated regularly.</p> <p>Membership</p> <p>JW confirmed that the membership strategy will be discussed in April sub-committee meeting.</p> <p>LG questioned whether BTF are surveying members every year?</p> <p>MB confirmed that TE are currently doing a substantial piece of research, but it is not feasible to do it every year. However, the research could be sampled - the sub-committee are looking into it.</p> <p>Participation</p> <p>MB questioned whether TEMB are happy with the areas targeted – all agreed. LG queried MB whether the participation figures can be shared with the Regional Committees. MB agreed.</p> <p>It was evident that Clubmark and Starmark vary within regions. MB confirmed that this depends on regional programme manager (RPM) focus and priorities.</p> <p>Performance</p> <p>GM referred to the ‘Proposed Activity’ section and confirmed there was no mention of finding athletes and confirmed that this needs to be included. In addition the first activity section is set and the others have none defining status. MB confirmed there is a degree of commitment required. So if Sport England (SE) doesn’t fund it then TE has to pay for it.</p> <p>LG proposed there needs to be another discussion as to whether TE can actually fund this and whether some needs can be met from BTF. There is also a need for a condition on funding if it is to be part of a strategy.</p> <p>GM also confirmed that the appropriate wording should be: “TE in conjunction with BTF”.</p>	<p>MB</p>
--	---	-----------

	<p>There was a short discussion on where the funds will come from and there is a need to have commitment from the TEMB. It is evident that there needs to be further discussion on the before committing funds from other sources.</p> <p>MB confirmed there will be planning figure on Thursday 22 March and there should be a discussion with SE in October and another meeting about talent in January. The planning figure will give a clear indication of funding.</p> <p>Strategy statements</p> <p>MB confirmed the strategy statements will be signed off in May, subject to and hearing from Sport England.</p> <p>Communications</p> <p>The communications framework needs to be clear on where and how the growth and membership are communicated in order to populate communication aspect. This will follow after membership and growth.</p> <p>Action: MB and RT to have a discussion regarding business framework</p> <p>LG raised concern about uncontrolled communications with members and wants to make sure there is not an email overload.</p> <p>A short discussion suggested that it would be a good idea if members could opt out of different categories of British Triathlon and Triathlon England and therefore select what enews information they would like</p> <p>HW stated that she is happy to get involved with a bigger protocol with TE. HW suggested that the BTF document can be easily adapted. LG is to input.</p> <p>Action: HW and operations department to implement and liaise with LG and SR about enews</p> <p>Handbook and Trinews</p> <p>A question was raised as to whether the Handbook is valued by its members. There was a short discussion involving the suggestion that it becomes electronic to reduce cost.</p> <p>Action: JW to find out what the financial implication of producing and printing the handbook. To discuss with HW and to address as a membership issue to the membership committee.</p> <p>Action: The membership review will identify the value of the handbook to members. JW along with the membership committee to come forward with the results and ideas to the TEMB</p>	<p>RT, MB,</p> <p>HW, LG and SR</p> <p>JW</p> <p>JW</p>
--	---	---

<p>3</p>	<p>Finances</p> <p>JL stated that the finance process has been better and more transparent this year and, as a consequence, more issues had arisen.</p> <p>JL referred to the Collaboration Agreement (CA) and it clearly states (in para 4.5) that TEMB and the BTF Board should have reciprocal sight of each budget, subject to certain conditions, at the same time. This did not happen this year, perhaps as a result of the late signing of the CA. TEMB had still not seen the BTF budget.</p> <p>Action: JL to circulate the redacted, Home Nations version of the British Triathlon budget.</p> <p>JB has seen the HN version and confirmed that some level of deficit is expected as it is Olympic year. Some of the deficit is shown under 'Events'; an additional burden arose from the need to finance the Canary Wharf event. Operational costs are higher than expected in the 4 year plan.</p> <p>HW confirmed that additional spend was expected in 2012 at the end of the four year plan because it is an Olympic year. However, BTF are better off this year than originally planned. JB clarified that two years ago BTF made a massive surplus and is now spending it and that is why BTF invested in Canary Wharf.</p> <p>JB had circulated two documents before the meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Event Permitting and Day Membership Review 2012 Terms of Reference / Proposal 2. Additional Information to the Triathlon England Management Board, 17 March 2012 <p>JB confirmed that TE budget process highlighted the need to review the current fee structure associated with Event Permitting and Day Memberships to ensure that the fees are fair and appropriate to event organisers, and to rationalise the way those fees are allocated between British Triathlon, Triathlon England and Welsh Triathlon.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the current structure has been in place for in excess of five years.</p> <p>In taking it forward, there is a timetable below:</p> <p>March 2012 – Review begins Mid-April 2012 – Stage One complete May – Paper to BTF / TE / WT Board with outcome of the stage one review</p>	<p>JL</p>

	<p>June 2012 – Stage Two complete Early August 2012 – Communication to Event Organisers September 2012 – Event Registration for 2013 Opens, Stage Three complete January 2013 – New fees come into force if relevant</p> <p>It was confirmed that the working group will be:</p> <p>Jem Lawson James Barton – Finance Duncan Hough - Events, Rules & Technical The group would be chaired by IB.</p> <p>In moving forward it was decided that the event permitting review will progress in stage 1 will be BTF, and in stage 2 TE will work in parallel with Wales and Scotland. A discussion needs to be had with Wales and Scotland.</p> <p>Monthly accounts</p> <p>JB confirmed the accounts remain on track to hit the forecast and we are slightly ahead of forecast. Membership had seen greater than expected growth in January.</p> <p>The current membership position has just exceeded 14,000 and the February numbers are encouraging. The combined membership/day membership income will achieve the revised forecast.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Competition Review and Events, Rules & Technical matters</p> <p>The concept of two British Championship weekends, one for duathlon in April/May and one for triathlon in July /August, is one which finds favour. It will meet the first objective of the competition review and raise the credibility and standard of British Age Group Championships. There are some reservations and TEMB would seek some additional clarity:</p> <p>JL confirmed that there is a misconception that TEMB are against the proposed British weekends. JL clarified that TEMB are not against these events. However, TEMB have raised concerns to make sure they are successful. A concern which was raised was the worry that the races contain a significant half of the qualifying positions. Having 50% of those qualifying positions will heavily reduce people participating in other events.</p> <p>HW pointed out that discussions elsewhere had moved the concept forward and that some amendments had already been made to the original proposal</p>	

	<p>Actions: HW to take the queries to the BTF. JL would like the regions to have an input and also looked forward to receiving information about the survey canvassing the opinions of the members. There needs to be an agreed timetable to go to the regions to obtain feedback.</p> <p>GM referred to the last TEMB meeting and questioned whether there was a discussion about whether people can qualify to represent England, Scotland and Wales in the British Championships. GM saw the possibility to create an opportunity for people to represent their country as beneficial. Furthermore, GM questioned whether there was any further thought for provision of long distance Triathlon England Championships?</p> <p>HW confirmed that BTF board does support this provision</p> <p>After a short discussion there was agreement to the continuation of LD Triathlon and Cross Triathlon British Championships in some form.</p> <p>Action: HW to send in two weeks details for qualifiers as part of Festival Weekends HW will an amended presentation.</p> <p><i>Lunch time 12:40</i></p> <p>Next meeting supposed to be May 19; changed to May 26 at Loughborough or Holme Pierrepont .</p> <p>BTF Governance Review (additional item)</p> <p>JL informed everyone that there will be a potential change in the BTF governance as SMS finishes her combined President and Chair role after six years at the end of 2012. There was a discussion as to the advisability of splitting the chair and president role and the impact on the organisation of doing so. To implement the proposed changes, UK Sport could help with the definition of the chair role; TC will circulate the results of a triathlonscotland/sportscotland review of the roles of chair and president and SMS will write a review of what her role has encompassed. These three pieces of data will be used to inform the debate.</p> <p>At this point the BTF staff members left the meeting at the request of the Chair.</p> <p>It was concluded that the TEMB will discuss the TEMB governance beyond 2012 in the next TEMB meeting in May.</p>	<p>HW</p> <p>HW</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Membership</p> <p>JW confirmed that the membership committee is back on track after concerns about how the committee is functioning. However, one member of the subcommittee group has left and now looking for other</p>	

	<p>members.</p> <p>JW confirmed there has been no comment on the strategy statement so far and there had been a virtual meeting in February and a face-to-face meeting in Sandown park. At the Sandown meeting it was agreed that our own membership questionnaire is being combined with the Birmingham University research.</p> <p>Action: Send any comments on the membership survey to JW</p> <p>JW confirmed there had been a 68% month-on-month increase in January membership. The full figures for February were not yet available.</p> <p>JW concluded that the membership survey will be fully analysed and results returned at the end of May. Furthermore, 'Join a Friend' strategy is still being worked on by SR.</p>	JW
6	<p>Performance</p> <p>GM confirmed that he had had a substantial meeting with MB, ZHP and SM where a substantial increase in investment to the regional programmes was discussed. This will be for the academies and regional head coaches. The intent to increase funding into regions was made clear from MB, ZHP and SM and agreed to be relayed to the board</p> <p>If the funding plan is adopted, the intention is for the coaches to be paid, maintaining the same triangular relationship between coach, regional committee and TE management. The contract for coaching time will be between TE and coach. Accountability will remain to the regional committee with a consistent framework, though operations will not necessarily be the same from region to region but things have to have the flexibility to have different regional input. MB looking to have a greater degree of management of the head coach, with regions getting reports from local picture (coach) and national (TE)".</p> <p>GM/MB confirmed that the TEMB can report back to the Council of the intent to increase academy funding, without specific values at present</p> <p>Coaching review process – Considerable progress has been made on a process of review and evaluation for the Regional Academies and self-evaluation for the Regional Head Coaches. There will be a strong template of reviewing academy and the self practice of the coach which will be rolled out to the regions which should provide a tool for the coach to report back to the committees.</p>	

<p>7</p>	<p>Council appointed members</p> <p>Regional issues to be discussed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DR raised a regional concern that there needs to be a more robust system to make sure all coaches have CRB checks and wondered whether Loughborough to send reminders. There was a reiteration that TE/BTF does not license coaches, but the system of checking should be more robust. <p>Action: MB to check whether there is a list of who is CRB checked and whether reminders can be circulated.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. LG confirmation that the BTF awards contain a lack of transparency of what the awards are and the regions need to be aware of the system and understand it. There is a request of a review of those processes. If anything needs to be changed then needs to be done now. <p>Action: JL to chase up the review of BTF awards</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. FR (Y&H Chair) would like a referee template as the list of officials at HQ does not match his list. <p>Action: MB to initiate MW to have a meeting with FR about official template and official issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Regional treasures template. Regions have been contacted with little feedback, but those who replied confirmed that they are happy with their own template, but it would be helpful to have as a tool. <p>Action: MB to chase the regions about the Regional Financial reports for 2010 and 2011. This was supposed to be for September. LOG to write a letter to regions at the end of this month.</p>	<p>MB</p> <p>JL</p> <p>MB</p> <p>MB/LOG</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>BTF</p> <p>Taken as read</p> <p>JB confirmed that the reserves policy is still outstanding and needs to chase up with RW (BTF Board Finance). There has been a debate on the contingency and how it will be used as part of the budget. This year TE has grown its own reserves been approved by the management board. Additional spending out of the TE reserve element, up to £20k will be with notice to BTF CEO and Chair.</p>	

<p>9</p>	<p>Actions from January</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Membership have not been informed 2. JL confirmed that there is a BTF coaching steering group which consists of PM, chair (BTF), BF (triathlonscotland), JBW (Welsh Triathlon and GOB (TE). 	
<p>10</p>	<p>Operations</p> <p>Report taken as read.</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>Development</p> <p>Report taken as read.</p>	
<p>12</p>	<p>Other competent business (of which notice has been given)</p> <p>JL updated the TEMB about the disciplinary case: The report was sent out and a conclusion has been made. The next stage is for ZHP to inform the involved parties. JL Thanked JB, JP and CC for being part of the panel.</p>	