

Minutes of the Triathlon England Council Meeting held on Saturday 24 March 2007 at the Netball/Badminton Centre, Loughborough University

Present: Amanda Cantle (Chair)
Derek Biggs (SW)
Lawrence Green (WM)
Martin Harris (SE)
Keith Perry (E)
David Rigby (NW)
Steve Robertson (NE)
Morgan Williams (Y&H)

In attendance Norman Brook – CEO
Mark Barfield – Director of Development
Jem Lawson – Chair of Triathlon England
Katherine Brand (minutes)

Apologies:

ITEM	MINUTE	ACTION
1.	<p>President's Introduction and Comments</p> <p>AC welcomed everyone to the meeting, and each person introduced themselves.</p>	
2.	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>John Petrides (London) East Midlands representative</p>	
3.	<p>Minutes of the Last Meeting</p> <p>All Council members confirmed that these had been received.</p> <p>Accuracy</p> <p>Page 3 – delete 'from non regional chairs to be members of the Council' and replace with 'for a region to be represented by someone other than the chair'</p>	
4.	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p>Page 3</p>	

	<p>JL stated that, in agreement with the Articles of the Association, a person could not be co-opted onto the Board. JL is therefore in the process of enquiring as to whether Carole Billington-Wood would assist in a consultancy role with regard to development.</p> <p>Page 5</p> <p>No. 6 - JL was under the assumption that he would be required to attend Council meetings therefore would not have to be invited to each and every meeting.</p> <p>No. 8 – This would usually be decided by the Board, but the Board was not in place when the decision on the logo was to be made.</p> <p>No. 9 – Now a duty to be undertaken by the Board.</p> <p>Page 6</p> <p>JL felt that JP was not in a position to stand as the TE representative, as it must be a member of the TE Board. Also, the decision cannot have been made due to there only being 4 votes. AC suggested that ‘the Chair of TE will sit on the BTF Board’ should be included in the job description. It was also stated that this should have been a Board decision anyway. MH explained that this was not possible as there was no Board in place prior to the decision being made. The Council expressed that they were happy for the TE Chair to be the representative and that the Board would make the final decision at a future meeting.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Roles and Responsibilities</p> <p>Having read the Minutes of the last meeting, NB considered the roles of both Board and Council membership should be clarified. The document previously circulated explained mainly the roles of Board members, in that this carried legal responsibility of the company. NB went through the papers, outlining the responsibilities of Council members, Board members and Directors. MH asked about the company registration. NB explained that the word “England” is a sensitive name and evidence from a higher authority needs to be sought. Letters of support from Sport England and the DCMS have been requested. NB went on to emphasise the differences between the Board and Council - the Council are representative of the membership and appoint the Board with the Board reporting back to the Council. MH stated that he would be happy to remain in his role as a Director on the Board, although he was unsure as to whether this could be accepted due to the absence of a representative from the London region. AC stated that as it was the decision of the individual, it could be confirmed regardless of a London representative. MH confirmed that he wished to remain in position. DB supported this decision.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Report from the TE Board</p>	

	<p>Following this morning's meeting, JL reported that the Board had agreed the proposed budget and summarised the document put forward to the Council. He explained the staff costs and how this would be split between BTF and TE and that the costs to run the Loughborough office would be split 50/50 between BTF and TE, leaving Wales and Scotland out this year. A decision was still to be finalised regarding affiliation to the BTF by each Home Nation. It was proposed that each Home Nation will pay £1 per member affiliation fee, with a further £5 per member to fund the non-Olympic programmes. DB enquired as to the contribution from Wales to the office costs. NB explained that at some point Wales and Scotland would be charged. MH stated that the Council should be prepared for potentially negative comments from English members who believed that they were supporting Welsh and Scottish Long Distance athletes and Duathletes.</p> <p>JL gave an overview of the paper tabled at the Board meeting detailing the Funding Investment in TE Regional Delivery and Talent. NB went on to explain the allocation from the Performance budget of £2,000 per region to fund a talent academy as part of a regional talent programme, with a further £3,750 for a regional talent coach to run the academy. Ideally, each region would have a regional talent coach to run the talent programme, with leadership from the National talent coach. Athletes from the Regional Academies will then go forward to Area Camps, with the most successful being selected for the Development Squad. JL reported that the Board had approved the budget.</p> <p>Strategic Plan</p> <p>JL reported that the Board were not in a position to complete this yet, but Senior Management in Loughborough and portfolio Directors were to discuss their relevant sections and complete the strategy. It would be completed by 19 May and then presented to the Council at the following meeting. Shared service agreements were also discussed and Robert Moorehead-Lane would take responsibility and draw up a contract listing various service provisions, with each having their own SLA.</p> <p>Staff reports and Board reports were received.</p> <p>JL emphasised the importance of recruiting a Finance Director to ensure the Board had a full complement of Directors and that the gender imbalance was addressed.</p> <p>JL invited questions. None were received and the report was happily received by the Council.</p>	
7.	<p>Presentation: Regional Statistics</p> <p>MB delivered a presentation detailing various development issues</p>	

	<p>regarding TE and invited questions during the presentation. He discussed the Regional Plans and stated that the regions would need to take these on Board and commit to the objectives. MB advised that every region had achieved its KPI for Event Participation. He then provided an update on the Kids of Steel events and explained the link to the KPI target for increasing school-club links. He indicated that the funding proposal that each region would be allocated £3,000 to achieve the KPI for Club Accreditation had been approved by the Board.</p> <p>With regard to Regional Capacity Building, MB put forward his proposal, which had been accepted by the Board, for the opportunity for regions to bid for a share of £30,000 to administer the region and achieve the KPIs set. These bids would be taken to the Board on 19 May for approval. The development team would need to take a proactive, rather than reactive approach, and each region would have a target for the RDO to raise funds for regional work.</p> <p>MB briefly discussed the IRC event and emphasised the regions' responsibility. JL explained the bidding process to the Council.</p> <p>MB invited questions.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Regional Issues</p> <p>AC explained that this item would be on the agenda as a means of the regions sharing ideas and examples of good practice and would develop over time.</p> <p>North West – DR had nothing to report.</p> <p>Eastern – KP explained that the region was aiming to hold a referees course and expressed concern regarding the current qualification process. He also informed the meeting that the region had an accredited centre in Norwich.</p> <p>South East – MH enquired about any initiatives other regions had implemented to increase the amount of accredited clubs. MB stated that he believed the success in the NE and NW regions was due to the personal strengths of the RDO. NB suggested publishing a list of accredited clubs and raising the profile of these clubs. AC agreed, stating that this could encourage competitiveness between the clubs.</p> <p>Yorkshire and Humberside – MW stated that the region was struggling to fill the referee courses and suggested that regions pull together to hold courses on the border of the 2 regions.</p> <p>West Midlands – LG added to the discussion about KPIs and suggested that there should be some reward for those regions who over-achieve on their KPIs.</p> <p>North East – SR shared some examples of best practice. He</p>	

	<p>explained about the regions pool of equipment to which all clubs have funded and have access to for events. This has proven to be a great way to save money on races. The regional committee has approached the Police to enquire about access to bikes for children who wouldn't normally have the chance to ride. KP suggested this could be implemented for the Kids of Steel events.</p> <p>South West – DB expressed his concern regarding the low percentage of event entrants and club members who weren't members of Triathlon England or any other Home Nation association. KP stated that he is aware of clubs that make it compulsory for their members to be members of the Association due to insurance issues. LG added that his club has its own insurance for non-TE members, but this is not as comprehensive as the insurance offered by the national association. NB explained that the Board will be reviewing membership.</p> <p>MB invited all regional representatives to provide feedback from the regions with regard to what they would like to be included in the forthcoming congress weekend.</p>	
9.	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>This was arranged for Saturday 30 June at 2pm.</p>	
10.	<p>Other business, of which notice has been given</p> <p>None.</p>	
	<p>Close of meeting 17.00.</p>	