

Minutes of the Sport England Board meeting of 3 February 2021 (held remotely by videoconference)

- Members** Nick Bitel (Chair)
Natalie Ceeney
Azeem Akhtar
Rashmi Becker
Chris Grant
Sue James
Andy Long
David Mahoney
Tove Okunniwa (Items 3-14)
Karen Pickering (Items 3-13)
- Officers** Mike Diaper ED – Children, Young People and Tackling Inactivity
Ali Donnelly, ED – Digital Marketing and Communications
Jon Fox, Strategic Lead – Investment Design (item 6)
Tim Hollingsworth, Chief Executive Officer
Cathy Hughes, Head of Equality and Diversity (item 9)
Serena Jacobs, Director – Finance
Charles Johnston, ED – Property
Richard Mabbitt, Board Secretary
Simon Macqueen, Director – Strategy
Jayne Molyneux (items 11 and 12)
Lisa O’Keefe, ED – Insight
Chris Perks, ED – Local Delivery
Nick Pontefract, Chief Operating Officer
Phil Smith, ED – Sport
Viveen Taylor, Strategic Lead – LSEG (items 7 and 9)
Lynsey Tweddle, Head- Corporate governance (item 9)
Chris Whitaker, Senior Disability manager (item 9)
- Guests:** Michael Stark, Interim Head of Sport – DCMS
- Apologies:** Ian Cumming

1. Chair’s Welcome and introductory comments

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees. The meeting was being held remotely under ongoing COVID-19 social distancing measures. The Chair noted the continued challenges for attendees in managing personal commitments under lockdown, including home-schooling and thanked them for their

flexibility.

- 1.2 The Board welcomed Michael Stark to the meeting and noted that Adam Conant would shortly be taking up the role of Head of Sport at DCMS.

2. Apologies for Absence

- 2.1 Ian Cumming had tendered apologies.

3. Declarations of Interests

- 3.1 Rashmi Becker noted that Step Change Studios had delivered the inclusive dance competition for the London Youth Games School Games event and was currently working with them on a social media dance initiative. The Board was content that this did not represent a conflict of interest in respect of the wider discussions to be held under item 11 on School Games.
- 3.2 No further declarations of interests additional to those already registered were made by members.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 4.1 The Board **AGREED** the minutes of the previous Board meeting of 8 December 2020 (paper MB21-01) as an accurate record of events.

5. Matters arising

- 5.1 The Board reviewed the log of decisions and actions (paper MB21-02).
- a) On Action 6.7 (NGB Portfolio) from the meeting of 8 September 2020, Phil Smith confirmed that the cohort of Active Partnerships were included in the NGB Portfolio review.
- b) On Action 6.8 (Whyte Review) Phil Smith reported that the Review was likely to extend further beyond its initially anticipated reporting date. Sport England was in discussion with the review team on the cost implications of this.
- 5.2 Board members were content that matters arising from previous meetings were either complete, satisfactorily in hand, or to be addressed under later agenda items.

- 5.3 Due to the exceptional circumstances relating to the governance structure required by government, and the urgency of the Sport Winter Survival Package, the Board had approved by correspondence on 16 December the transfer of delegated authority to the CEO and Chair of the Investment Committee (as the two Sport England members of the SWSP Independent Board) for all grant (not loan) award decisions on the Sport Winter Survival Package greater than £2.5 million (Board paper [MB20-79](#) refers).

6. CEO Update

- 6.1 Tim Hollingsworth and Executive Team members spoke to paper [MB21.03](#)

Uniting the Movement launch

- 6.1 Tim Hollingsworth and Alli Donnelly provided read out of the *Uniting the movement* launch and immediate reactions from stakeholders and partners (summary slides filed as [MB21-03A](#) refer). The Board thanked and congratulated officers from across Sport England who had contributed both to the development of the strategy and to the launch itself. Board members
- a) commended the professionalism of the launch event;
 - b) felt that the high levels of positive engagement with stakeholders at all levels (from Secretary of State to grass-roots organisations) were a consequence both of the collaborative approach to developing the strategy, and on the persuasiveness and substance of the strategy itself. The inauspicious circumstances of an extended lockdown, and severe pressures across the sport and physical ecosystem made this level of support even more impressive;
 - c) were pleased by the accessibility of the launch and publication arrangements;
 - d) noted the strong sense of "we're part of this: how can we help?" from stakeholders, which augured well for the implementation of the strategy.

Planning for Implementation of Uniting the Movement

- 6.2 Tim Hollingsworth introduced the planned implementation approach. The Board would review the Transition Plan further at its meeting of 22 March 2021, informed by the deliberations of the Investment Committee meeting on 26 February 2021.
- 6.3 Board members felt that the sense of unity, and energy engendered by the launch event set the tone for the implementation phase. The challenge for

Sport England would be to maintain this momentum without compromising on a co-creative approach, while simultaneously dealing with urgent and unpredictable COVID-driven demands. The Board noted the proposed approach, timelines and the likely implications for capacity, resources and priorities of both Sport England and its partners. The Board was content with the broad approach of:

- a) a one year transition plan for 2021/22 to be agreed by March;
- b) a three-year implementation plan to 2025 to be launched by September (rather than June, as had been the preferred time before increased levels of COVID restrictions and the most recent national lockdown were called by Government);
- c) externally published documents for both (a) and (b) demonstrating how *Uniting the Movement's* long-term philosophy and commitments were already shaping Sport England's early priorities.

6.4 The Board noted that the work being carried out in the implementation of the strategy was additional to must-do work against existing commitments, and that many staff had been under prolonged pressure from sustained COVID-19 response activity. COVID-19 had also directly affected the morale and capacity of Sport England, with home-schooling and childcare needs a particular concern. The Board acknowledged that while motivation across the organisation remained high, there was increasing evidence of stress, and current workloads in parts of the organisation were unsustainable. The Board noted the capacity impacts on key front line and back office parts of the organisation, and the constraints to addressing this imposed by Sport England's pay and recruitment obligations as a public body. The Board therefore supported officers' ongoing dialogue with DCMS around maximising the impact of Sport England's Administrative Budget and seeking further outsourcing solutions where appropriate.

Active Lives (Children) Report

6.5 The Board noted the summary of findings from the *Active Lives* Survey of children's engagement in sport and physical activity.

Chair/Member appointments; Member appraisals; Board effectiveness

6.8 The Chair reported that appraisals with all members were complete and had informed his recommendations to DCMS about the potential reappointment of those members whose first terms expired in 2021. The key themes in respect of wider Board effectiveness emerging from all members'

appraisals had been discussed with Tim Hollingsworth and duly disseminated to Executive Team. Natalie Ceeney had fed back separately to the Chair with Members' feedback on his performance in that role.

- 6.9 One consistent suggestion from Board members had been for further exploration of lessons learned from the Local Delivery Pilots and next steps. Board members felt that a facilitated discussion here would be useful both developmentally and in terms of taking forward Sport England's work in this important area. **Action: Tim Hollingsworth** to consider further how this might best be delivered.
- 6.10 With regard to the appointment of a new Sport England Chair, Natalie Ceeney reported that a strong shortlist of six appointable candidates had been submitted to the Secretary of State by the Assessment Panel on which she had sat alongside DCMS and independent members. Interviews were scheduled for March. This timing allowed little room for flexibility or delay and assumed that an incoming chair would be available to assume the role almost immediately. The Secretary of State had therefore indicated that the present Chair's tenure could be extended for a short period if necessary. Natalie Ceeney would share her thinking on induction priorities with Tim Hollingsworth and Board members. **Action: Natalie Ceeney**

Delegation update

- 6.11 The Board agreed the delegation relating to Sport England's banking arrangements as set out at [Annex 1 to paper MB21-03](#)

7. Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Report

- 7.1 Given the brief interval since the last Board meeting, and with the key issue of *Governance Code for Sports* diversity targets to be discussed separately under [item 9](#), an oral update was provided by officers and Rashmi Becker as Board Champion for EDI.
- 7.2 Viveen Taylor introduced herself to Board members. She would shortly be taking up the role of Director of EDI, being currently Sport England's Strategic Lead, on low socio-economic groups). Board members:
- a) noted the number and quality of applicants for the role: a positive reflection on Sport England's stated commitment to EDI;

- b) with equality a central theme of *Uniting the Movement*, were pleased that the post was conceived as a co-ordinating and leadership role, with EDI a priority for all staff;
- c) noted that the EDI Director role was primarily outward-facing and focussed on tackling inequality in access to and participation in sport and physical activity, including diversification of partner organisations. Internally, Executive Directors remained accountable for EDI within their directorates;
- d) noted the useful connections between Viveen Taylor's current and new roles and were happy to engage directly with her where this was helpful.

7.3 Rashmi Becker provided readout from the Sport and Recreation Alliance *Fit for the Future: Stronger Together* conference of 27 January 2021, at which she had presented. She noted the strong support expressed by participants both for *Uniting the Movement's* focus on equality, and for the way in which stakeholders had been engaged throughout and into the implementation phase. She reported much enthusiasm among stakeholders to progress this agenda, but less knowledge about 'the how'. She noted also a desire from participants that Sport England was robust in its approach to high profile EDI failings by the 'big' sports. Participants had emphasised the need for cultural change rather than mechanistic 'tick box' solutions. The misuse of social media and its role in normalising racial and other abuse, had been discussed. The effectiveness and role of unconscious bias training had also been debated.

7.4 Mike Diaper flagged Sport England's engagement with Cabinet Office Disability Unit officials on the National Strategy for Disabled People, where there was considerable positive crossover with *Uniting the Movement*. Publication of the strategy was expected in the Summer. The Strategy's otherwise wide brief excluded the benefits system, but Sport England's alongside DCMS was seeking to influence the Welfare Green Paper which will explore the benefits system. Board members noted the need for government to engage meaningfully with those affected by the strategy and were pleased that Sport England was feeding in learning from its Local Delivery Pilots.

7.5 Tim Hollingsworth reported good progress on joint Home Country Sports Councils' (HCSC) work being carried out to tackle racism and racial inequality in sport and physical activity. The Sheffield Hallam team was now analysing gaps in workforce leadership and other key roles in sport. The parallel qualitative project led by AKD was generating much compelling testimony of how racism and racial inequalities played out in sport and

physical activity. These multiple narratives of inherent prejudice would doubtless be uncomfortable to many in the sector. Both projects were expected to conclude their analyses at the end of February. The HCSCs were currently considering how best to bring the results of both together to prioritise long and short terms actions arising. Board members noted the hard-hitting nature of the AKD work in particular, and some Board members cited their own anecdotal evidence of conscious bias and exclusion. Board members felt that in their response, the HCSCs needed to recognise the flaws in the workings of the sport and physical activity ecosystem, be ready to show how they themselves were taking action, and how they were enabling their wider partners to do so.

- 7.6 The Chair thanked members for their views, and asked officers to take them on board in progressing work in this key area. **Action: Phil Smith and Nick Pontefract**

8. COVID-19 Sector Response Update

- 8.1 Phil Smith introduced paper [MB21-04](#) summarising key developments across Sport England's COVID-19 sector response activities.
- 8.2 The Board noted the intense activity undertaken since its last meeting on the Sport Winter Survival Package (SWSP). The SWSP Independent Board (membership including Natalie Ceeney and Tim Hollingsworth) set up by Government to oversee funding allocation had met five times since it was constituted on 15 December 2021 and funding decisions totalling 122 million had been made to date to a range of sports and organisations. Sport England Officers (with support from Deloitte and Sporting Assets) were tasked with providing the wherewithal for the SWSP Board to function and make effective evidence-based decisions, and with administration of the grant and loan arrangements resolved by the SWSP Board. The Board:
- a) noted the delivery and communications challenges inherent to a set of stakeholders who varied widely in terms of the quality of their governance and financing arrangements; where attaining perfect equivalence between sports and organisations was neither desirable nor possible; and in a politically charged policy arena. The presumption toward loans rather than grants set by government was contentious for some stakeholders;
 - b) noted that Government was commissioning a study to identify the ownership of the ongoing loan book. Board members felt that Sport England was clearly not well placed to take his role on.

- c) noted that with the SWSP having covered loss of spectator and event income only until the end of March, discussions were ongoing with regard to a successor spring/summer survival package, in the expectation of some continued COVID-19 restrictions after April 2021, even if a full lockdown could be incrementally relaxed by then.
- d) The Board agreed that despite this work being novel to Sport England, unprecedented in scale and urgency, challenging in terms of stakeholder management, and delivered under substantial COVID-19 related stresses, SWSP governance, decision-making and the allocation of loans and grant funding was functioning remarkably effectively. It asked for its thanks and congratulations to be formally extended to officers involved.

8.3 The Board discussed support to local authority leisure providers, particularly the activity undertaken on the National Leisure Renewal Fund (NLRF). This £100m of Exchequer investment (with Minister for Sport sign off on decisions of a grant oversight committee) was aimed at supporting leisure services' reopening and recovery and preventing further closures of outsourced leisure trusts and operators. Board members noted that all but one eligible authority had submitted applications, and that programme administration was running effectively and expeditiously, with the first payment having been made within 2 weeks of decision. The Board:

- a) noted that Sport England and its partners were working with government to develop the case for a further round of NLRF funding, including analysis of the rich data being generated by the initial round;
- b) noted the collaboration between authorities necessitated by the NLRF, and their increasing recognition of the compelling business case for a more joined up approach positioning sport and leisure as a key part of wider public health, transport and community agendas;
- c) was impressed by the speed and effectiveness with which the NLRF had been developed and implemented, and asked for its thanks to be shared with officers responsible.

8.4 The Board noted and were content with progress reported for:

- a) the Community Emergency Fund;
- b) Sport England support to partners through guidance and expertise;
- c) current award flexibilities;
- d) 2021-22 awards 'rollover';
- e) intelligence gathering on sector impacts;

- f) work on supporting the sector workforce. Board members welcomed proposals here to support independent practitioners;
- g) the Tackling Inequalities Fund, where the Board noted particularly clear feed-in to *Uniting the Movement*, and potential for expansion and increasingly targeted action to reach communities and individuals with whom the fund had not yet managed to engage);
- h) Innovation and Tech, where the Board noted the forthcoming agreement with an innovation learning partner to work with fundees and help develop local support networks. Given the importance of tailored support for innovative projects, and the relatively low number of successful 'open' bids, Board members supported the shift in emphasis in Sport England's work here away from a great ideas fund and more towards a platform for matching Ideas with partners.
- i) Sector Renewal Fund. The Board noted here that although only a small amount of budget had been spent, officers were confident that this would ramp up dramatically before the year end, given the Fund's late start.

8.5 Lisa O'Keefe and Ali Donnelly introduced paper [MB21-05](#) (which set out for internal and stakeholder use key summary data on the impacts of Covid-19 for consumers and the sector) and provided an oral update on work being carried out under Sport England's Keeping the Nation Active priority. Board members:

- a) were pleased that Sport England was sharing this insight, noting that Local Delivery Pilots and core cities were combining it with local qualitative data to shape recovery plans;
- b) felt that it showed clearly the differential impacts of COVID-19 across society in terms of people's sporting and physical activity, and that beneath the headline figures were both causes for optimism (for example a growth in informal sporting activity among some girls and women) and some very concerning trends, (not least the significantly greater rates of decline in activity by young Black, Asian and ethnic minority people);
- c) noted that this was part of a broader picture of social inequity that the pandemic had exacerbated. While much of this lay outside Sport England's direct remit and influence, it was nonetheless vital for the success of *Uniting the Movement* to understand and exploit its touch-points with sport and physical activity. This would maximise the role that Sport England and the sector could play in delivering public health and community benefits through working with Public Health England, local authorities, the Departments for Health and Social care and for

Education, and others.

9. Finance Report

- 9.1 Serena Jacobs introduced the Finance Report (paper [MB21-06](#)). The Board noted the summary of forecasts; lottery income; and exchequer cashflow. The Board noted that Lottery sales and returns to good causes were performing better than projected and the forecast for the year had been duly increased to £208m from the £204m budget.
- 9.2 The Board reviewed management information presented in the paper on key financial measure; lottery income; progress to budget; awards expenditure; and cash impacts, with no substantive comments. The Board noted the need to continue monitoring particularly carefully the exchequer budget for overspend, and for continued attention to the pace at which money was channelled to partners. The Board noted that separate allocation had been made in respect of administrative support for the SWSP and NLRf.
- 9.3 Overall, the Board was content with the report and thanked Finance Team for the clarity of its presentation.

10. Code for Sports Governance Report

- 10.1 Lynsey Tweddle with Cathy Hughes and Chris Whitaker briefed the Board about progress on the review of the Code (paper [MB21-07](#) refers). The review covered all aspects of the code, with the highest profile of the areas under consideration its approach to diversity and inclusion. At this meeting the Board was asked to review proposals specifically on the use of targets to help address the representativeness of boards in the sport and physical activity sector. These recommendations built on extensive consultation with the sector, including the Board's own prior discussions. As the Code was jointly owned by UK Sport, the proposals were being presented in parallel to the Board of UK Sport at its meeting of 4 February 2021. Wider aspects of the review continued with the full suite of recommendations coming to the Board at its meeting of 22 March 2021.
- 10.2 The Board felt that the paper usefully contextualised the specific decision around targets. It felt the methodology set out in the paper and the evidence base was sound. The Board acknowledged that no one formulation of targets would be perfect and on balance **AGREED the**

approach recommended as Option 3¹. In forming this consensus, the Board discussed at length the options presented, concluding that:

- a) Option 1 (No change: retain existing 30% gender-based target only, with no targets for other protected characteristics) was no longer tenable. At the launch of the Code this had been a stretching but not overambitious ask for many of the organisations in scope. It had prompted tangible improvements and established a positive direction of travel while mitigating against the risk of tokenistic appointments. It was, however, now timely to set the bar significantly higher.
- b) Option 2 (new targets for gender and other protected characteristics reflecting whole population demographic data) was attractive in many ways. It gave scope for boards to be representative across a range of protected characteristics, with a clear case having been made by stakeholders for introducing ethnicity and disability targets. On balance, however, the Board felt there needed to be a degree of flexibility in the targets. Primarily, an over-rigid approach risked legal challenge; did not reflect demographic variation across the country; and could in some cases perversely incentivise tokenistic appointments.
- c) Option 3 (new targets with mandatory minima but some flexibility) was felt to be overall the most effective approach. The targets proposed would provide challenge to those slow to change, without inhibiting those in the vanguard. It signalled the trust and co-operation that a 'one size fits all' approach was less likely to bring about. Partners engaged in setting targets rather than having them imposed were more likely to take ownership of the long-term challenges of securing more representative Boards, and less likely to adopt quick fix solutions. The Board noted that this was also the most legally robust approach.

10.3 The Board also felt it important that: the text of the Code; the launch arrangements and communications material that supported it; ongoing

¹ New targets (with mandatory minimums but some flexibility)

Set a minimum target for certain protected characteristics but with a focus on flexibility.

-50% women (with flexibility – e.g. boards with an odd number of members)

-minimum 15% ethnically diverse

-minimum 15% with a disability and/or long-term health condition

-up to 20% capturing wider diversity – this will require organisations to think about what is important to them in terms of diverse perspectives in their board discussions and for their organisations. It may include aspects such as geography, age, LGBT+, socio-economic status, educational background and would be agreed with Sport England and UK Sport as part of the organisation's diversity action plan.

support provided to in-scope organisations; and dialogue with them in the course of business was very clear about the nature of the flexibility provided for in the targets and the rationale for taking this approach:

- a) The targets should be seen by organisations as part of a wider systemic and cultural approach to embedding equality, diversity and inclusion. How organisations went about meeting the target was therefore as important as achieving it.
- b) Some Board members flagged the possibility of organisations not seeking to push beyond the minima. Rather, all should be pursuing best practice rather than compliance and any bodies that only met the minima would need to be able objectively to justify this.
- c) Representativeness at board level was vital. But organisations should not be satisfied with this alone. Diverse senior management teams were particularly important and it was largely from this cadre that a pipeline of new talent for board-level appointments would be drawn.
- d) Cascading good practice to constituent bodies was particularly important where boards were populated by representatives of these. Increasing diversity among the independent members of such boards was welcome, but not a long-term solution.
- d) Intelligent target setting using the flexibility permitted under option 3 would also require more Sport England/UK Sport resource to work with and support partners to develop suitable targets. With different organisations at different stages of maturity with regard to EDI, Sport England should look to create supportive networks.
- e) Building-in flexibility made the targets less clear-cut and therefore harder to communicate and celebrate, and could make compliance less straightforward to assess.
- f) There was a risk that if the discretion allowed for in option 3 was not communicated clearly some stakeholders might initially perceive it as a get-out clause for organisations who should be doing better.
- g) It would be important to justify on the basis of evidence having the same target for disability as ethnicity to show that these were not arbitrary figures.
- h) There would be principled concern from some stakeholders about the inappropriate use of targets and their unintended consequences, and it was important that these were responded to robustly, on the basis of evidence, and in the knowledge of wider sector support. Crucially, any simplistic inference that increasing diversity compromised organisations' ability to get the right skills on board needed strong rebuttal.

- 10.4 Having this discussion in mind, the Board felt that a degree of flexibility on the gender target was justifiable also. While the aim was for parity on the basis of the whole national population (and in this case, regional variation was not applicable) a range of ratios of 40:60 to 60:40 would retain a balanced representation, without incentivising tokenism or holding back exceptional female role-holders.
- 10.5 The Board reflected further on the societal context into which the targets would be introduced. Given the evidence of entrenched discrimination in some organisations, it was vital that the targets came with a clear message that the Boards of sporting bodies, particularly those funded by public money, must aspire to be reflective of whole populations, rather than their traditional or current membership. Board members shared initial views on how the targets would be used, both in terms of monitoring progress, and of leveraging positive change, including how leadership by national level bodies was translated down to grass roots organisations. The Board noted the potential for annual progress review with 'name and shame' or name and fame'. Mandatory data collection was discussed, and the need for publication of diversity action plans that showed a serious approach to diversity in workforces. While accountability for meeting targets lay with organisations, Sport England's role in monitoring and publicising compliance was a powerful one.
- 10.6 The Chair thanked all discussants and asked for the Board's decision and supplementary comments to be progressed by officers and UK Sport colleagues. **Action Lynsey Tweddle**

11. Funding for the network of school games organisers

- 11.1 Mike Diaper spoke to paper [MB21-08](#) which set out exchequer funding arrangements from the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport and the Department of Health and Social Care to fund the national network of 450 School Games Organisers. The funding was managed on Sport England's behalf by Ecorys with a small proportion of the exchequer funding allocated to that Ecorys's administration and programme costs. The Board was now asked for approval to transfer the Exchequer funds to Ecorys to administer grant payments to School Games Organisers for the financial year April 2021 – March 2022.
- 11.2 The Board noted and was content with the programme summary, finance summary, approach to learning and evaluation, governance Implications, risk analysis, and legal implications as set out in the paper.

- 11.3 The Board **APPROVED** an award of up to £10.71million to Ecorys for the financial year 1 April 2021 – 31 March 2022. With formal confirmation of a currently outstanding Department for Health and Social Care component of £4.41 million expected imminently, the award would be made either:
- a) as a single award and payment of £10.71m (if and only if the additional £4.41m is confirmed on or before 1 April 2021); or
 - b) as two awards and payments (the first of £6.3 million in April 2021 and the second £4.41 million (as soon as and only if - DHSC confirmed the final share of the funding)).

Action: Mike Diaper to progress

12. Funding from the DfE to help schools open up their facilities for community use

- 12.1 Jayne Molyneux spoke to paper MB21.09 which sought Board approval of arrangements to distribute additional exchequer funding from the Department for Education to the network of Active Partnerships to help schools open their facilities after the school day, at weekends and during school holidays. Board members noted that this funding rose from commitments in the Governments School Sport and Activity Action Plan to ongoing collaboration at national level to ensure that sport and physical activity became an integral part of both the school day and after-school activities. The funding sought to build on a prior £1.5 million award to the 23 Active Partnerships who had been part of this work to date, and would also fund the remaining 19 Active Partnerships to do so.
- 12.2 The Board was content with the strategic and values assessments, equality implications; delivery options analysis, budgeting and capacity implications, risk review and legal and governance implications as presented in the paper. Board members:
- a) flagged the opportunities for building relationships and finding efficiencies through working at a national level with multi school trusts;
 - b) noted the potential for join-up between state and private schools
 - c) were pleased that the Department for Education's approach to evaluation appeared to be focussed on impact across the piece rather than short term outputs, and that a steering group of representatives from Department for Education, Sport England and Active Partnerships was being set up.

12.3 The Board

- a) **APPROVED** a £10.1 million Exchequer grant from the DfE to be awarded to the network of 42 Active Partnerships to work with schools in their local area to help them open their school facilities after the school day.
- b) **APPROVED** the delegation of the approval of these individual awards to Mike Diaper, as Executive Director Children, Young People and Tackling Inactivity and Jayne Molyneux, as Director Children and Young People in line with Sport England's delegated authority policy, given that individual awards to Active Partnerships would be based on the numbers of schools in each area plus capacity funding and would range from £125,000 to £1million,

12.4 **Action: Mike Diaper** to progress

13. Annual Report and Accounts (ARA) Flat Plan and Approach

13.1 Serena Jacobs introduced the 2020–2021 ARA flat plan and proposed production approach (paper [MB21-10](#)). It was intended that these be discussed in further detail at the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee of 16 March 2021.

13.2 The Board was content with the proposals as presented, and for them to be progressed to Audit, Risk and Governance Committee discussion. **Action: Serena Jacobs**

14. Any Other business

14.1 With no other items of business having been raised, the Chair thanked members and officers for their contributions and closed the meeting. A short debrief would be held for Board members and CEO only, to be followed by a meeting of the Chairs and Remuneration Committee. The Board would next meet on 22 March 2021. A further remote meeting was anticipated.