



**Present:** Jem Lawson (JL) Chair, Duncan Hough (DH), James Barton (JB), Francis Riley (FR), Bill James (BJ), John Mills (JM), Richard Fuller (RF), Howard Vine (HV), Sally Lockyer (SL), Paul Gardner (PG)

**Apologies:** N/A

**In attendance:** Mark Barfield (MB), Anna Moss (AM) minutes, Zara Hyde Peters (ZHP), Gareth Hall (GH)

**Referenced:** Helen Wyeth, (HW), Kay Simmet (KS), Mary Hardwick (MH), Frank Baddick (FB), Alison Sibcy (AS), James Taylor (JT), Ian Howard (IH), Devang Rana (DR)

Item	Minutes	Action
1.	<p><b><u>Opening remarks</u></b></p> <p>JL welcomed everyone for coming to the meeting. The Board thanked ZHP for all her hard work since the recent announcement of leaving the BTF. JL highlighted that he would be stepping down from his role as Chair at the end of the year.</p> <p>JL pointed out that there would be a Board meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> December instead of one in November at the AGM. He also hoped that this would be an opportunity for his successor to attend this particular meeting once appointed.</p>	
1.2	<p><b><u>Apologies</u></b></p> <p>Kay Simmett (KS)</p>	
2.	<p><b><u>IT/Digital Update</u></b></p> <p>JL explained the current status of the IT digital collaboration with BTF. JL spoke about how there had been work completed in moving forward and an agency (Kynsale) had now been selected to help.</p> <p>BJ explained that with such an ambitious strategy the impact on marketing and communications would potentially cause numerous problems for IT, therefore they had been seeking assistance from external agencies with an expertise in this area. BJ continued to explain that out of seven agencies they had selected an enthusiastic company called Kynsale. Those in attendance were made aware of the</p>	

	<p>outstanding proposal delivered by this company, which set them apart from the others.</p> <p>ZHP detailed that after careful consideration they had secured a two year deal with this company with the option to extend. This would be at a cost of £12,000 and would come from the operations budget.</p> <p>PG pointed out that this company had previously worked with Australian Cycling membership therefore had knowledge of what does and doesn't work. PG detailed various advanced systems the company has in place which allows them to process outcomes more effectively.</p> <p>SL stated that it will be very beneficial rather than having it as a one off project.</p> <p>ZHP explained that business mapping conducted by MH had highlighted the areas that needed communications and IT, which were required in order to progress their projects. ZHP pointed out that this flagged the volume of resources required.</p> <p>BJ stated that there would be steering group meetings at Loughborough with himself, MB, MH, HW, PG and KS in attendance.</p> <p>PG queried if it would affect communications as it felt very IT driven. BJ replied explaining it is a project of things we want to happen. BJ highlighted that the objective of this project is to support the ambitious strategy for the organisation. With core objectives to add structure, manage and deliver towards goals.</p> <p>BJ gave an overview of why we are going through this process and the objectives from the brief. BJ said that the outcome will show how decisions are made, how projects are managed and give clear outlines throughout.</p> <p>PG queried the implications of the assessment of projects. BJ explained that this is in the portfolio part of the process and there have been no assumptions of who is to take the lead.</p> <p>RF questioned whether the IT department's workload would be affected. BJ clarified any current work will continue, but as part of the process Kynsale will identify any changes that need to be made on a prioritisation approach.</p> <p>JB queried how we keep IT resources evenly split between TE and BTF. ZHP said it is split but it's about helping to create understanding of their workload on a daily basis. ZHP reiterated that it is about managing the message of what this project is doing, and will do, as at present it is currently still invisible.</p> <p>FR questioned why there wasn't a map of what we are currently working on with IT and suggested something be put in place. BJ</p>	
--	--	--

<p>3.</p>	<p>responded by explaining they have the first steps set to answer those questions from the outcomes of one of their meetings. PG emphasised that people don't know what is going on and we need to change how it is communicated.</p> <p>SL said that we need to plan and structure what we do and show how we do it. She highlighted the Ovens &amp; Co research which indicated a lack of understanding about what TE is doing, explaining it needs to be communicated better especially to key stakeholders. SL suggested it would be wise to put our major project updates on the website.</p> <p>PG suggested that information should be visible on the website with details of what we are currently working on.</p> <p>BJ went on to explain the plans of the steering group and how they would be meeting in person or by conference call every Friday morning. BJ encouraged anyone who wants to find out more or have more involvement to speak to him.</p> <p>BJ explained the timeline of the project is aiming to be completed by the end of May. BJ highlighted that there would be an update at the BTF Board meeting on April 26<sup>th</sup> and also at the TE Board meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup> May.</p> <p>BJ spoke of how the process would be communicated effectively to the Board to ensure involvement throughout. BJ made it clear this wasn't about producing a report it was about making actions.</p> <p>SL said it would be beneficial to see the results of the process mapping exercise. ZHP agreed but wanted to send it to BJ to confirm details before sharing with the Board. BJ suggested that as they are sending a communication to stakeholders to outline the project would it be best to attach it to that. ZHP decided this was a good idea. BJ asked if this could be completed in the next five day.</p> <p>JL stated this had all become very positive and was pleased with the progress.</p> <p><b>Events</b></p> <p>GH explained that all events have a signed MoU in place outlining what exactly the relationship is with all being subtly different. This gives a clear guideline with the expectations and provides a commercial rights package as a supporter of the event. GH said that the next key step is making sure we utilise the rights package to the best effect and communicating the right messaging across to show it is TE supported.</p> <p>SL asked if it would be monitored. GH confirmed it would be and all are required to have some branding to show that they are supported.</p>	<p><b>BJ</b></p> <p><b>ZHP</b></p>
-----------	---	------------------------------------

PG questioned why there were still non-affiliated events and why. DH answered by explaining that nobody knows and unfortunately data isn't consistent. GH suggested that one of the main reasons is because we don't offer a good enough package, but hoping to change this with the work by Two Circles.

GH said that there is a good variety of participation events coming up both geographically and with type. GH expressed the positive reaction towards women only Tri Pink and that their events have a capacity of up to 1500. GH stated that they have great potential to develop over the next few years.

### **Go Tri**

JL moved on to speak of Go Tri and queried how far along we were with this process.

GH responded explaining that during the recent meeting concerns were raised around the timing system and the cost against how best we deliver it.

JL questioned what had so far been seen with coaching and Go Tri in order to draw participant into events. MB pointed out that the profile of Go Tri training amongst the triathlon community would always be less, as it's very much a recruitment product; however It has been proved that the product works. There is due to be a meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> April with Everybody Active who are keen to push for national coverage and move it ahead. MB highlighted that with all partnerships these have been by far the most proactive in moving Go Tri forward.

RF explained that he had the opposite experience whilst running a Go Tri event with Everybody Active. MB said it may differ from person to person as it is about finding someone to champion a product they believe in.

MB detailed that the issues with the website had been the main problem and had unfortunately restricted the growth of the product; however there is now a solution in place to move forward. MB continued to describe the positive outcomes of Go Tri with the Olympic Park happy to run events with the support from eleven London.

BJ highlighted that the Go Tri website has been outsourced completely. ZHP suggested awareness was needed with the other work by Two Circles and that something new was being piloted. ZHP stated that the website is a time challenge and it is about making sure we have the right pieces in place to go forward. ZHP commented on how critical it was in order to make sure there are no major technology changes and to keep doing continual honesty checks.

PG questioned if all Go Tri events were north based. MB confirmed that they were working very hard on the south.

	<p>PG asked how they currently are communicating Go Tri information. BJ suggested that Go Tri information should be on the main TE webpage whilst the website is being created.</p> <p>SL suggested the next step is to engage others that aren't triathletes. The meeting agreed that they should look further afield.</p> <p>PG asked if there was a database of regional press. ZHP confirmed there was. ZHP stated that static communication about Go Tri would be very beneficial.</p> <p><b>National Champs</b></p> <p>PG queried the role of the Board at a National Championship event. All board members gave details of the various roles. ZHP agreed to get the protocol of BTF Board document sent over to the Board to help give guidance.</p> <p>JL detailed his conversation with IH in relation to the British Championship events and talk of introducing a long distance event.</p> <p><b>Officials</b></p> <p>DH pointed out there has been some administrative issues for TE and BTF. DH highlighted that with National Events only three officials outside of England are doing BTF events. DH explained expertise is in house but the timescale is unknown, AS is required to monitor this and will feedback at the end of the year. DH highlighted that BTF and TE need to be working together on this. MB explained AS is fully funded by Sport England and with the strategy signed off we are pushing to deliver a good service for race organisers, members and clubs. MB pointed out that if the Board were to change the strategy this could have implications.</p> <p><b>Current Month's Report</b></p> <p>BJ detailed the current TE Monthly report status and that it is still in development.</p> <p>PG questioned where the KPIs come from. BJ responded explaining they are to come from the leads of each area. JM explained that the KPIs are critical followed by supporting points and then any high level comments afterwards.</p> <p>JL expressed his interested in working out a way to feedback about reports that are not seen in Board meetings. The Board agreed this would be beneficial.</p> <p>BJ highlighted the importance of using a steering group as they will</p>	<p><b>ZHP</b></p>
--	--	-------------------

	<p>focus upon the strategy with KPI targets and feedback. JB and ZHP suggested there should be a director summary at the top of the report. MB agreed.</p> <p>PG asked why there wasn't a risk register. MB explained that unless there was anything new it wouldn't be submitted each month.</p> <p><b>Membership</b></p> <p>PG explained that he had not long been in post but had already had a positive start. He detailed his work with SR and the encouragement of gaining more support but also his future ideas that would give more accessibility for memberships. PG finalised by explaining in four weeks he hopes to have much more to report on.</p> <p><b>Marketing</b></p> <p>SL spoke of the 300 new members gained at Sandown which had been simple but very effective process. SL explained the technical issues onsite which caused problems but having the use of iPads made it very easy for membership sign ups. SL said she would circulate marketing and communications plans for Go Tri with Go Tri learners.</p> <p>BJ questioned if the Commonwealth Games would be featuring in this. SL responded by saying it would have a part in the Baton Relay as it is relevant to Go Tri.</p> <p><b>Finance</b></p> <p>JB explained that finance reports were not ready due to the year end and they would be out next week. JB emphasised they are in a good financial position especially with a buffer for any unforeseen issues.</p> <p>FR said that in the way the finance reports were presented was good clarity and had a positive overall approach.</p> <p><b>Talent</b></p> <p>JM detailed that JT had been unfortunately been unwell. He then provided an update on the current status of talent with the Talent Camp hosted at Welbeck College.</p> <p>JM explained there is a programme in place to test coaches every two years to monitor quality.</p> <p>JM stated they needed to set solid KPIs but was unsure of whose responsibility it was. MB responded saying that it would be himself and JT to work this out. MB detailed that it was about quality measuring other areas to monitor what we do and how we go forward. MB highlighted it is the quality of the path way and learning to improve.</p>	<p><b>MB</b></p> <p><b>SL</b></p>
--	--	-----------------------------------

PG asked how TE compares to America and Australian talent programmes. MB responded by stating that these other countries have no formalised triathlon talent pathway.

BJ questioned what the timescales were for the Commonwealth Games squad. JM clarified they had narrowed it down to 23 from 45, and it would be confirmed on 1<sup>st</sup> June after the Hyde Park event.

### **Commercial Opportunities**

MB explained that they are looking at a new clothing supplier and that from six companies they have found two potentials; Chain Reaction Cycles and Nuffield. The clothing supplied would be a mixture of tech kit, leisure, officials and merchandise for members. BJ stated that this would also be an opportunity for clubs to have kit and clothing created specifically for them.

ZHP gave an update on marketing support with Synergy, explaining it is all helping to give guidance on market place principle partners. ZHP continued on to say that by building the brand and identity of Triathlon all helps to encourage sponsors.

ZHP asked if anyone at the meeting had any contacts from suitable brands to send her an email.

### **Council and Regional Affairs**

JL spoke of his meeting with DR and their plan to review the TE regulations. JL explained that in order to move forward easily it needs to be more accessible. The programme is to be presented after their meeting.

RF questioned what do TE do for the South East with gaining access to venues and should they contact the Regional Manager. MB explained that they work with the South East to keep things moving but work on a case by case basis.

GH explained that there had been issues with open water venues however MB spoke about how five years ago Anglian Water had a blanket ban but now are showing a positive attitude. GH pointed out that even though it wasn't a quick movement it is considerable steps forward.

MB said that sailing clubs are good to target as they gain PR for their club facilities when triathletes use them.

RF queried if emails are sent out about races and was that the correct approach. MB clarified that only specific cases on what is supported will be sent out. GH reiterated that the membership are told what we

	<p>support, he explained that an email has been sent out to all events organisers detailing the criteria to become associated. MB pointed out that more events had been taken on than anticipated.</p> <p>FR questioned if there were any procedures in place for repeating non compliance events organisers. MB explained it is a carefully considered process. GH continued to say that it needs to be sorted by September to address all concerned. FR suggested that there should be a review of the Summer to be put in place for September. MB agreed.</p> <p>JL asked for a progress report from DH and GH and feedback at the meeting in May.</p> <p>FR next queried if VAT was payable on the IRC entry fees paid by the regions and if so was there a way in which we can have the fee deducted at source pre grant. This was agreed as sensible though Council appointed members would need the approval of all regions before this could be put into place. This will delay the payment of the regional grants until Council appointed members come back to MB with clear answers from all regions.</p> <p>FR next queried electronic banking which was raised at the previous meeting. It was agreed that it was a matter to take up with the Council.</p> <p>FR proposed Yorkshire and Humberside region to be renamed to simply Humberside or Yorkshire. It was decided this was a matter for the Council and the AGM.</p> <p>HV queried the status with the Young Persons Review and recommendations; he also questioned the current status of 1StopShop, School resources and club guidelines. MB explained that it didn't fit into funded work but a member of staff is set to drive it and it'll be on the website in September.</p> <p>HV questioned the coaching funding payment system and what the regions got in income. It was agreed it was a Council matter.</p> <p>HV shared his frustration and questioned why the South Central article was pulled from Tri News. HV claimed there was a severe lack of communication.</p> <p>DH questioned why there was no list of events on the website for clubs or regions. The Board agreed it would be wise to contact the regions and ask what events are happening so they could be put on the website. PG suggested a contact that might be able to help.</p> <p>DH spoke of how there is no communication to the Board on how changes may effect them. RF explained there was a proposal with the Council from DR and this could be sent back via Jem.</p>	<p><b>DH, GH</b></p> <p><b>JL</b></p>
--	---	---------------------------------------

**BTF**

JL gave a summary of the BTF Board Meeting in April with its major events and explained that SL would be at the ETU congress. JL also highlighted the positive outlook for the Commonwealth.

ZHP summarised by telling the Board about the positive choice for an office move and the flexibility for extra space, stating it had really displayed how much the organisation had grown.

ZHP thanked everyone for working with her over the years; she expressed her sadness in leaving such a great team but would continue to support the sport.

**AOB**

No other business.

**Action points of the meeting**

BJ to answer any questions about the steering group status

ZHP to send out the communication document sent to stakeholders to the Board.

ZHP to send out document detailing the role of a Board member at an event.

MB to create a TE Director summary for each TE Monthly Report

SL to circulate marketing and communications plans for Go Tri with Go Tri learners.

GH and DH to provide progress report at May meeting

JL to feedback to the Board about proposal from the Council.