



Minutes of the Council meeting held at 8:30am on Saturday 17th May at Eton Dorney Lake

Present: Derek Biggs (DB), Lawrence Green (LG), Dave Rigby (DR), Howard Vine (HV), Francis Riley (FR), Aimee Stocker (AS), Tom Chant (TC)

Apologies: Matt Honey (MH), Richard Fuller (RF)

In attendance: Jem Lawson (JL), Mark Barfield (MB), Gareth Hall (GH), and Anna Moss (AM: Minutes)

Referenced: Mike Townsey (MT), Rick Velati (RV), Brendan Purcell (BP), Malcolm Westwood (MW)

Item	Minutes	Owner and Due Date ¹
1	<p>Presidents introduction and comments/apologies for absence</p> <p>DR welcomed all present at the meeting.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes from last meeting</p> <p>The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the last meeting.</p> <p>DR mentioned he had met with JL and they had agreed that both would have full access to both Board and Council files.</p> <p>The Council also agreed that the minutes are to have a summary of action points like TEMB.</p> <p>The TE operations business plan is to go to Council and potentially to be reviewed on a quarterly basis.</p>	AM to Action
3 3a	<p>Board member terms and other council matters</p> <p>DR questioned the council on what the terms served by Board members, and anniversary dates for the directors with portfolio should be.</p> <p>It was decided that all current terms would be extended to four years, and terms already served would be counted in four year terms. It was agreed a slight adjustment to DHs term would be made enabling it to</p>	

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

<p>3b.</p>	<p>come up at the same time.</p> <p>MB explained the process to replace the TEMB Chair. The role advert to go out on the 8th August, deadline for applications on the 12th September, short listing between the 15th and 30th September with interviews on the 18th October. The new chair would be announced at the AGM on the 15th November.</p> <p>LG suggested that the role details should be in the member newsletter before the advert goes out, allowing people to look at the website and also highlight that JL is stepping down after eight years. This was agreed and MB suggested it should go in July's Tri News as well.</p> <p>FR queried where the advert would go. MB confirmed it would go on the TE website, Sport England website and anywhere else the Council would feel most appropriate.</p> <p>LG emphasised that the candidate shouldn't have to have international experience in order to apply. JL suggested they revamp the job description. He confirmed he would be handing over to the new Chair at the 13th December TEMB meeting and would be stepping down on the 31st December.</p> <p>DR summarised by confirmed that there would be a review the job descriptions. He suggested due to the extensive work involved there should be to lead on this. It was agreed that DB, RF, MB and JL would steer this and it be ready for the 25th July TEMB meeting.</p> <p>The topic went on to consider the regulation changes subcommittee which was previously discussed at Council. JL tentatively suggested making the co-opted director one of two women who had previously been interviewed for a Board position.</p> <p>LG stated that this couldn't be done just to gain gender balance.</p> <p>The Council agreed they needed to advertise this role and it would be in place for a two year period.</p> <p>FR queried why the review was taking place. JL explained the specific issues driven by business partners. JL highlighted that we wanted to enable members to take a more active role. JL advised a review of the voting system especially with relation to proxy and electronic voting.</p> <p>JL said it would be a group to meet and discuss a timeline for us to move forward. LG stated the regulations are not fit for purpose anymore so it is about making them relevant.</p> <p>LG explained that this needs member consultation along with discussions between the Board and Council to set a framework for</p>	<p>DB, RF, MB, JL to Action – July TEMB Meeting</p>
-------------------	--	---

<p>3c.</p>	<p>moving forward. LG stated there wouldn't be sufficient time to complete this review for the 15th November, however the Council agreed some elements would need to be taken to the AGM.</p> <p>FR raised concerns over the size of the project. DR explained that until they look into the project they wouldn't know the finer details.</p> <p>LG stated that by advertising the role has the benefit of showing members what we are trying to achieve.</p> <p>FR explained the current issues with Yorkshire and Humberside's current naming and an expressed interest to change it to simply Yorkshire.</p> <p>DR questioned the Council to whether there were any objections. AS queried what would happen with regards to the Talent Academies. HW highlighted that any club can join any region.</p> <p>MB continued to say that from any academy perspective it is about hosting the athlete in the appropriate place, however that doesn't cover the IRC selection.</p> <p>There were no objections and it would be put forward at the next AGM</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Regional issues</p> <p>DR said that the regional reports were well received and the Council thanked FR for his hard work.</p> <p>FR stated the ongoing issues with an event organiser who doesn't comply with the rules and regulations. FR queried if we could refuse an event organiser. It was agreed no system was currently in place but during the review of the regulations this could be addressed.</p> <p>LG suggested that an event organiser who doesn't comply with a risk assessment should undergo some form of disciplinary procedure. TC referenced how other sports work with this sort of problem.</p> <p>The discussion continued into a debate of what could be done to resolve this ongoing issue. It was agreed that if an event organiser hasn't complied repeatedly then the disciplinary procedure is flexible enough to work as a last resort.</p> <p>MB reminded all that there will be some circumstances out of the event organisers control and they shouldn't be penalised for that. It should be aimed at those who are repeat offenders.</p> <p>JL gave a suggestion with a procedure to potentially put in place to</p>	

	<p>avoid further problems. FR agreed it was a good idea and that as part of the overall review the Board and Council should empower the new subcommittee to look at rules and technical. FR recommended inviting one or two of the event organisers to potentially input as well.</p> <p>MB suggested that previous plans to bring the regions together in November could be a great opportunity to invite some of the event organisers as well.</p> <p>TC raised the issue of lobbying for facilities access based on feedback from London Clubs. It was highlighted that this was in the operations plan but not in the budget. JM to action by discussing with MP for a potential partnership.</p> <p>TC went on to speak of Go Tri in particular the web site lateness was a significant factor. MB explained the website was set back due to a new company taking on the project but is on track to launch soon.</p> <p>MB said there are 28 Go Tri events this month and that they are remaining optimistic with hitting targets.</p> <p>DR expressed what a positive impact a Go Tri event had, that it had increased club members and many novices took part.</p> <p>JL pointed out that the BTF and TE AGMs would both happen over the same weekend in November. He also made the Council aware that the BTF Awards this year would be a smaller affair and be invite only.</p> <p>MB explained his vision for the AGM weekend with the main priority to engage members in getting involved. MB declared his interest in having awards this year for TE.</p>	Action MB
5	<p>To consider a report from the Chair of the Board</p> <p>JL congratulated FR on his comprehensive report.</p> <p>JL explained the current process for the replacement CEO of BTF. Twenty applicants, eight interviewed, with four to be interviewed next week in Loughborough.</p> <p>JL highlighted that with ZHP leaving, in the interim IH will step in and to take a proactive role HW, MB and BP.</p> <p>JL mentioned that it was no longer required to be a dormant company after consulting MT. LG agreed, with JL to take the lead on this.</p> <p>JL stated that I.T has been stretched therefore Kynsale is mapping a timeline to help move us forward. This report would be provided at the end of the month. JL expressed his nervousness as with progression being heavily reliant on the digital platform.</p>	

	<p>JL spoke of the work being conducted by Two Circles. JL stated that he would be feeding back to the Home Nations to monitor the impact of this. MB pointed out that Welsh Triathlon had shown an interest in Go Tri and they were being kept involved.</p> <p>JL briefly highlighted the current status of the Steering Group set up by BJ and the Go Tri marketing plan that are both to be discussed at Board.</p> <p>JL went onto to say there had been no yearend figures but there would be no shocks as TE was approximately 70k up. JL highlighted that the finance and operations department is currently stretched with increasing pressure; therefore it needs more support especially with the growth in membership.</p> <p>JL summarised by saying that the key thing for TE is the development of the membership package.</p> <p>JL highlighted that Talent is currently undergoing a review of the regional head coaches. He added that the Commonwealth Games selection is coming up after the London Hyde Park event, with the representing athletes being announced on the 6th June.</p> <p>FR questioned the difference between the current Talent Program and BTF elite performance program. JL and MB detailed the climbing effect of how the TE Talent Program works, highlighting the current collaborations between TE and BTF staff RV and BP.</p> <p>FR pointed out that it isn't a clear process and communication is vague. MB agreed stating communication from regional head coaches needed to be filtered down to the regions and athletes. MB explained it was a recognised issue but it would draw to conclusion in September following his tour of the regions.</p> <p>LG mentioned that when the budget was being drafted questions were raised about age group funding. LG queried if there should be crossed subsidy between different classes of member meaning age groupers pay for themselves. LG highlighted that part of the review was for BTF to consult members for feedback.</p> <p>MB explained that TE is trying to be more customer focused but it isn't a priority for performance unfortunately. HV stated that active members are age groupers and therefore need to be informed.</p> <p>It was agreed that JL and LG to feedback to MW.</p> <p>AS questioned if all the regions were having a paratri academy similar to the East Midlands. MB explained it's based on where the athletes are. MB to send the budget breakdown to AS.</p>	<p>JL and LG to Action</p> <p>MB to Action</p>
6	Report on sustainable coach education funding	

	<p>MB addressed the Coach Education sustainability explaining the costs involved. MB mentioned that royalties paid on each candidate go directly to BTF with that money going back into the development and course resources. MB highlighted that Level 3 is being subcontracted to BTF.</p> <p>MB explained the current time and cost implications of Coach Education. MB described the lengthy process of certification and IV.</p> <p>LG suggested that in the annual report BTF puts in the whole of the coaching expense and the credit for the budgeted fees expected. MB agreed to action this in the future.</p> <p>MB highlighted the extensive costs and time involved with Coach Education. MB suggested the regions cover the cost of running the program.</p> <p>AS questioned how much would the regions be charged. MB stated it would be around £68.00 per candidate. LG raised his concerns that some regions might make less. MB explained that numbers for courses are on the increase each year.</p> <p>LG suggested asking the regions about upping the cost and querying what is sustainable. MB mentioned that at present TE wouldn't be making any profit but the regions would be. TC queried if TE are contributing to the development cost. MB confirmed TE was.</p> <p>FR recommended a clear candidate cost to make it easier suggesting a candidate fee of £70.00. MB explained it could be tested with a staged approach.</p> <p>MB stated that there are flaws through the system; therefore it needs to be done in the fairest way so it can be tracked and monitored. MB requested any thoughts and feedback from the Council.</p> <p>TC queried if Sport England funding was taken away would it impact on this. MB agreed it would. MB requested any feedback before next TEMB meeting in July.</p> <p>FR could we agree on the wording that goes to the regions. MB agreed he would create a document and circulate it.</p> <p>MB summarised by explaining Coach Education is working closely with BTF and the ITU. They are reviewing the current certification system with 1st4Sport and the costs involved for being associated with the UKCC. MB highlighted that it was something he would like the Council to take this into consideration for a later discussion.</p> <p>MB asked if Council members could send an email outlining their vision for the sport in the next five to ten years.</p>	<p>MB to Action</p>
--	---	---------------------

7	AOB None DR thanked all for attending the meeting and confirmed the next meeting would commence on 13 th September. Action Points from the Meeting	