



**Triathlon Board Meeting – 25<sup>th</sup> July 2014, Stirling Highland Hotel**

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, Helen Wyeth, (HW), Kay Simnett (KS), Jack Buckner (JB1), Gareth Hall (GH), Jilly Holroyd (JH)

Referenced: Ulundi Makhanya (UM), Frank Baddick (FB), John Muddeman (JM1), Lawrence Green (LG), James Taylor (JT), Alison Sibcy (AS)

Item	Minutes	Action
1.	<p><b><u>Opening remarks</u></b></p> <p>JL welcomed everyone to the meeting in Scotland during the Commonwealth Games. He introduced and thanked guests JB and JH for their attendance.</p> <p>JB commented on how much he was looking forward to becoming part of British Triathlon and working with the team.</p> <p>JL congratulated JM for his hard work and contributions leading up to the Commonwealth Games.</p> <p>JL spoke of the appraisal process for TEMB members having a successful outcome last year. He mentioned that the second appraisals would commence later this year.</p> <p><b><u>Apologies</u></b></p> <p>N/A</p>	
2.	<p><b><u>Membership Project</u></b></p> <p>PG gave an overview of the current status of membership, highlighting some of the contributing work from Ovens Co, Kynsale and from the Board. PG emphasised that all contributions can be used to help move</p>	

	<p>forward. He explained that his observations over the past 6-8 weeks had highlighted how many areas are impacted by membership showing its importance.</p> <p>PG explained that having the Two Circles work implemented into a legacy system that may not be fit for purpose in the future was not the way to proceed. PG referenced an earlier meeting about Kynsale and that effective use of budget is essential in order to move forward.</p> <p>He spoke of the problem areas identified in case they needed to adjust the budget if required. PG highlighted the next main focus over the next two quarters is stopping the internally generated issues of membership.</p> <p>PG declared that membership interfaces are to be made more customer focused and user friendly. PG detailed some of the membership projects that had been launched recently; TriConnect, Go Tri, Commonwealth Games competition. PG also detailed the potential upcoming offers to be put into place and the aim for this to commence from January 2015.</p> <p>He went on to speak of communications in order to decide the best way to utilise TriConnect. PG explained to the Board the possible interest of a membership phone application and that investigation into the cost of outsourcing is in currently process. PG confirmed this would be completed through a tender process and would be in order to help steer the project.</p> <p>PG provided details of how the application would be beneficial by making it as easy as possible to join Triathlon England, but also make information more accessible to members.</p> <p>A discussion commenced at what the application would do and how it would benefit members. Concerns were risen about the cost and time impact.</p> <p>JB declared his concerns in reference to the membership targets and budgets. MB stated that the membership target was aspirational based on previous performances but wasn't as high as that conveyed in the Two Circles work.</p> <p>PG detailed the work done by himself and SR in working towards a tiered membership system to cater to a range of member needs. He explained that the main aim was to work with partners to boost membership rather than spending a vast amount of money.</p> <p>JB1 suggested that there should be more internal communication in order to avoid multiple conversations with potential partners. BJ explained the process between UM and himself to avoid this. BJ and PG</p>	<p><b>BJ and PG</b></p>
--	---	-------------------------

<p>3.</p>	<p>agreed to speak to make sure they link up to provide a mechanism to avoid this.</p> <p>JL thanked all for their contributions.</p> <p>JL spoke of TriConnect and that it is a British product driven by JM and FB. He described that it was created for Home Nation members but there is an issue of how it is to be sustained at an administrative level. MB explained that currently it isn't known how the ongoing administration for TriConnect will be managed and that on this basis he was reluctant to move it to membership. MB told the Board that the hours required to monitor the system must be reviewed, however it is a membership benefit and therefore would naturally fit with this department.</p> <p>MB explained that approximately 10k a year would be required to give the additional support to the administration side of TriConnect.</p> <p>BJ explained that it was a project that has its upsides and downsides however will all filter into the work to be completed with Kynsale. BJ suggested that the product is to be tested to smooth it out and work out how to engage members into it.</p> <p>MB emphasised that it does need reviewing to find a solution, but he supports the concept of the product due to potential in changing the sport.</p> <p>MB agreed to take this forward and report back.</p> <p>RF queried if the membership system would merge. KS explained there were three membership systems that made it very confusing. KS went onto explain once feedback has been received then eventually they would like to eliminate previous systems.</p> <p><b><u>Kynsale Presentation</u></b></p> <p>JL referenced the Kynsale work which identified the lack of knowledge of the number of portfolio projects. JL emphasised that it was about making sure that the infrastructure would be fit for purpose.</p> <p>BJ explained that currently it had been decided to spend 100k but were currently waiting on the BTF Board to decide on their contribution to this.</p> <p>JL said that the commitment is there with an understanding that they will be contributing.</p> <p>JL informed TEMB that BTF Board would commit to a 15% contribution.</p> <p>All were in agreement of this.</p>	<p><b>MB</b></p>
-----------	--	------------------

<p>4.</p>	<p>Discussions went on to explore other areas in which could help to reduce spending cost in areas that were no longer beneficial. Tri News and the BTF Handbook were both explored with the general feedback being that they should go digital to avoid high printing costs.</p> <p>FR commented that Tri News is out of date and should move onto a digital format.</p> <p>SL explained that they had identified that the majority of members wanted to be communicated with in a digital platform.</p> <p>JM commented on Tri News advertisement potential revenue needs to be done digitally. HW explained that there currently is no revenue it is only current sponsors. It had been agreed by BTF Board that Tri News would be going digital.</p> <p>JB1 stated that Kynsale is business critical for both BTF and TE with TriConnect reconfirming this. JB1 explained that its good reducing spending elsewhere but it shouldn't undermine the importance of the Kynsale work.</p> <p>It was agreed that MH and BJ would support the next stage of the process, with MB, KS and HW to implement and manage the work.</p> <p>All were in favour of the Kynsale collaboration.</p> <p><b><u>Events</u></b></p> <p><b>Go Tri</b></p> <p>MB explained the company that currently runs the system which runs Go Tri called complete ID is due to close. MB said that it presents an issue in moving forward but also provides the opportunity to buy and run the system in house.</p> <p>MB detailed the progress in getting feedback about the Go Tri website from Go Tri organisers. He continued to explain that once this had been completed they could move forward.</p> <p>RF shared his feedback about Go Tri and that it was negative in reflection of the timing wristband. He suggested using a method similar to Park Run in order to make it an easier and more cost effective timing tool.</p> <p>MB explained that a process similar to Park Run had been reviewed but the swimming element of triathlon meant it needed to be waterproof.</p> <p>BJ queried that if the feedback is negative would it revert to a manual process. MB confirmed this would be the case until something else was</p>	<p><b>MH, BJ, MB, KS and HW</b></p>
-----------	--	-------------------------------------

found.

JL summarised by saying that the debate would be extended after feedback.

### **Bidding Process**

DH referenced the Events Bidding document with particular interest to the two models of presentation from BTF and TE. DH explained they are waiting on event organisers' feedback and bids to come through.

DH told the Board they would leave the process running as it is, however look into running events for two years allowing them to become bench marks for other events.

DH emphasised that a key focus is to provide a range of distance events with regular communications between BTF and TE.

JL explained that the BTF events subcommittee is now fully functioning.

PG queried if there was a policy to add the criteria for events organisers to market membership. GH responded saying they couldn't do that this year but potentially could look at ways next year.

RF queried whether the race referees report from previous years is considered. GH explained that the reports are held and if there hasn't been one it is assumed the official wasn't there and that is taken into account.

RF suggested that if there is to be a change in the referees report to perhaps ask what should be done to make it a National Event.

FR questioned that if a technical official have an association with some event organisation, how valid is the relationship. DH explained that they are trying to get people to be more critical and giving detail for their answers.

GH suggested a beneficial idea would be a 360 review adding Board members contributions. All agreed it was a good idea for a more detailed report.

### **Non Champ Events**

JL commented about how TE presents itself at the big events with discussions circulating how useful it is.

MB explained that the TE trailer and branding is sent to National Champions and any TE associated events required. He went onto explain that the cost to transport the trailer is approximately £1000 which needs to be budgeted for.

<p>5.</p> <p><b><u>Monthly Report</u></b></p>	<p>A discussion commenced on where the trailer should be seen and how membership could be promoted through its visibility at events. MB said now is a good time of year to plan how it can be used more efficiently next year.</p> <p>BJ highlighted that one of the strategic priorities was to have more visible presence at events. BJ queried if the relationship with the TIA would be an opportunity to partner with others, support in getting us to events and also help with the cost. MB agreed this could be a possibility.</p> <p>MB explained that the direct membership sign ups at events work very well. MB expressed his interest in involving SL and PG to help with presence and visibility. MB suggested consideration to make it available to unregistered events in order to build relationships.</p> <p>GH and PG spoke of plans to pilot three unregistered events and permit them at no cost. It was decided that in return for this they would actively sell membership with targets they have to meet.</p> <p>DH spoke of a meeting between himself, GH and AS to discuss the events strategy to be presented in the September Board meeting. DH explained the discussion of why events are not registering and how they can encourage them to do so in future.</p> <p>DH emphasised that a key factor in unregistered events is the cost of registering regardless of event size. A conversation began with the conclusion to get cost cutting ideas up and running to test them out.</p> <p>DH suggested a conference call in August between the Board to discuss thoughts on how to move forward. All were in agreement.</p> <p>PG suggested sponsored Home Nations age group athletes to wear kit in order to promote with visibility at a smaller cost. GH explained there have been discussions between himself, DH and AS about getting a kit supplier to sponsor the English Champions.</p> <p>FR agreed this would be a very good idea but after talking to active event organisers, the general feedback was that it was a lot of money with not a lot in return.</p> <p>DH concluded by saying that if we always do the same thing we'll always get the same results and therefore there needs to be change.</p> <p>JL to speak to DH to arrange a conference call to discuss further.</p> <p>JL gave a brief overview of where we are now with the actions from the steering group meeting which have been drawn together by a</p>	<p><b>DH and JL</b></p>
---	---	-------------------------

spreadsheet created by MB. JL highlighted that not only will the steering group see this but it will be circulated to the Board as well.

BJ explained the steering group had created a strategy to drive it forward and identified what the department KPIs should be. BJ reference the steering group report explaining the next stage is to prioritize and bring the organisation to a realistic number of interconnected KPIs. He continued saying that this would be for the five priority areas; events, clubs, participation, members and communications.

#### **Staffing Organisational Changes**

MB told the Board of the minor staff changes. GH would now be line managing to SR, SP would solely manage the Regional Managers and MW would drive the major events programme. MB emphasised these changes have been made in order to allow more time for other priorities.

#### **Communications and Marketing**

SL provided an update of the current status of the Go Tri website with the intention of conducting consumer testing to feed into phase 2. SL highlighted that they have linked Go Tri to Google Analytics in order to monitor traffic, and to help implement the marketing and communications plan.

SL highlighted the social media activity with the Commonwealth Games competition which provided a reasonable uplift in followers. PG thanked AM for hard work in driving this.

SL pointed out there had been a 17% rise in users to the TE website. SL declared this was a positive step forward.

PG queried the contractual obligations of TE elite athletes. HW explained there is only a contract for appearance and sponsors; therefore it is a choice of the athletes themselves to promote items on social outlets. JL emphasised that whatever is done needs to be done delicately.

#### **Finance, HR & Ops**

KS explained there had been an efficient audit which had gone very well. JL emphasised a lot of work goes into this and is very much a two way process. KS explained they had looked at TE and BTF figures as a legal entity.

JB explained that there was nothing outlandish in the current TE figures, but pointed out this all goes back to the Kynsale conversations. He continued to say membership income was behind by 50k which may be

<p>6.</p>	<p>because the phasing is difficult to predict. JB highlighted that they are 80k ahead of costs in the communications and marketing area.</p> <p>PG questioned if there is any analysis of what is going on. JB responded explaining that it was because membership needs to move forward. MB emphasised that is a priority in order to make a change. KS highlighted that work with Kynsale will help to make a difference to this.</p> <p>It was decided that a discussion between GH and PG would be had about how to move membership forward.</p> <p>JB stressed his concern from the BTF side with JL explaining it was mainly due to a shortfall in sponsorship. SL said that it is better to hold out for the right sponsor.</p> <p>JB1 mentioned that there will be a reassessment of the situation once he is in post. He explained that with the right communication BTF will seek a partnership not a sponsorship.</p> <p>JB1 detailed a debate that came up in BTF Board meeting about appropriate level of reserves and what the appropriate level of funding required. JB1 also mentioned that If large NGBs hold significant reserves this may reduce grant funding.</p> <p>There were no significant changes to the Risk Register.</p> <p><b>Talent (CWG)</b></p> <p>JM explained that a lot of elements have been put on hold due to JTs commitment to the Commonwealth Games.</p> <p>JM gave a brief overview of the three phase selection process of athletes for the Commonwealth Games with no appeals. It was suggested the Board should write to every athlete, the coaches and JT to thank them for their contribution. JL to contact MB1.</p> <p><b><u>Commercial Opportunities</u></b></p> <p>MB told the Board that a document circulated from a potential partner will be discussed further by MB and PG to move it forward. MB highlighted that the aim is to find a unique member benefit with also the possibility of creating a novice bundle.</p> <p>MB moved on to speak about the process to find a new clothing supplier. MB explained that they had invited a number of clothing companies to submit a tender, but this has now been narrowed down to two. MB pointed out that the clothing would cover all areas from athletes to staff kit and therefore they would be seeking feedback. MB stated himself and AM are due to meet one bidder to look at the</p>	<p><b>PG and GH</b></p> <p><b>JL</b></p>
-----------	--	--

<p>7.</p>	<p>potential garments to be supplied.</p> <p>MB told the Board that TE wouldn't be hosting a shop in house and has no desire to do so.</p> <p>RF raised concerns about clothing costs. MB told that they would look to keep prices down.</p> <p>FR and HV gave feedback on the bidding process. FR wondered whether an opportunity is being missed for rebranding and asked for clarity from MB about how this decision has been made.</p> <p>BJ stated that he is to work with MB on this and review the process to feedback. JL explained that there is flexibility with timing so a review is important. MB explained that ideally they would like something in place in October.</p> <p><b><u>Council and Regional Affairs</u></b></p> <p>JL briefly explained his liaison with DR.</p> <p>FR queried the changes to the L1 coaching and insurance package. He explained problems that some local triathlon clubs had from the change and queried if there could be financial support in the regions.</p> <p>MB explained they are looking to reduce the number of bursaries but agreed it was a good solution. MB suggested FR contact him to discuss further.</p> <p>HV discussed the changes of the coaching guidelines review which LG has been working on. He explained that along with changes of coaching insurance many L1 coaches who deliver sessions are unsure if they are covered or not.</p> <p>RF raised the concern about tax with clubs and if there was liability for VAT. RF queried if there were government regulations information that clubs are aware of that could be provided for support. MB explained there was generic guidance but it doesn't cater to everyone. JB pointed out that it isn't TE's role to provide tax advice.</p> <p>JM and KS highlighted both HMRC sports club unit and the Sports and Recreation Alliance could help clubs.</p> <p>MB said he would bring this all into a useable guide for clubs to give them signposts.</p> <p>RF questioned that as a National Governing Body should we be lobbying more with Parliament. He went on to suggest a conversation should be had with parliament about more accessibility for the sport.</p>	<p><b>FR to Action</b></p> <p><b>MB</b></p>
-----------	---	---

	<p>HW explained that Brandon Lewis MP is the parliamentary contact and for RF to collate any questions or concerns before going any further.</p> <p>HV questioned the current status with the One Stop Shop as part of the Young Persons Review. MB explained he would look into it and feedback.</p> <p>HV also queried if the regional coaching review was on track for September. MB highlighted that it was still on track with himself and JT steering it forward.</p> <p><b>8. <u>Regulations Review and Co-option</u></b></p> <p>JL detailed that the TE Council were all in favour of the co-option. JL gave a brief update but highlighted that he would be engaging with the Council Appointed Directors to assist in that process.</p> <p><b>AOB</b> No other business.</p>	<p><b>MB</b></p>
--	--	------------------