Minutes of the Sport England Board meeting of 27 September 2022
(by videoconference)

Members
Chris Boardman, Chair
Rashmi Becker
Ian Cumming
Andy Long
David Mahoney
Karen Pickering

Officers
Jeanette Bain-Burnett – ED, Policy and Integrity
Joel Brookfield – Strategic Lead, Local Delivery
Nick Boulter – Strategic Lead, Special Projects
Ali Donnelly – ED, Digital, Marketing and Communications
Lisa Dodd-Mayne – ED, Place
Tim Hollingsworth – Chief Executive Officer
Lizzie Hughes – Director, Special Projects
Richard Mabbitt – Board Secretary
Simon Macqueen – Director, Strategy
Rachel Musson – Interim Chief Financial Officer
Nick Pontefract – Chief Strategy Officer
Naomi Shearon – Strategic lead, Strategy
Phil Smith – ED, Partnerships
Viveen Taylor – Interim Director, Policy and Integrity

Guests
Adam Conant – Head of Sport, DCMS (Items 1-14)

Apologies
Tove Okunniwa

1. Chair’s introduction

1.1 Chris Boardman welcomed attendees to the meeting, held remotely given the transition to Sport England’s new London premises, refurbishment work at Loughborough and travel disruption. He thanked members for their flexibility and welcomed staff attendees, including new EDs for Place and for Policy and Integrity, Lisa Dodd-Mayne and Jeanette Bain-Burnett

1.2 With the recent departures of Chris Grant and Azeem Akhtar, he was particularly grateful to Andy Long, Ian Cumming and Karen Pickering for agreeing to accept an exceptional extension to their second term of appointment. He was pleased that David Mahoney and Tove Okunniwa had
accepted initial short re-appointments subject to extension to a full three-year term by the incoming Secretary of State. The Board nonetheless remained stretched, and further delays in appointments would be problematic. He noted that the imminent submission from DCMS officials to the new Secretary of State on Sport England appointees would be supported by a Chair’s letter, which would highlight the importance of exemplifying *Code for Sports Governance* requirements relating to membership and appointment processes.

1.3 Chris Boardman noted that the current meeting was taking place at a pivotal time. Since June, Sport England work had continued apace over a spectacular summer of sport, most notably – in terms of Sport England’s contribution – a successful, engaging and inclusive Birmingham 2022 Commonwealth. However, the rapid escalation of a cost-of-living crisis; a period of political uncertainty followed by a new government (and in the last few days a significant Fiscal Event) had combined to make Sport England’s operating environment yet more challenging; and its role correspondingly important.

2. Apologies for absence

2.1 Tove Okunniwa was unable to attend and had sent apologies. Chris Boardman would feed her views on papers into discussion during the meeting and ensure she was kept abreast of the Board’s deliberations.

3. Declarations of interest

3.1 In respect of potential System Partners (to be discussed at item 14) the Board noted Andy Long’s declared commercial interest in Swim England (Speedo is Swim England official partner). However, given that the ask of Board at this stage would be around the deferral of a funding decision, a recusal was not deemed necessary. However, Andy Long would recuse from the anticipated final Board decision at the December 2022 Board meeting. Other members’ declared interests in swimming organisations were not substantive enough to represent a conflict of interest. Rashmi Becker had registered that her dance studio received a small amount of funding from Mind and wished to abstain from any related decision at item 14.

3.2 No further interests were declared by members additional to those already registered.

3.3 Chris Boardman reminded members of the need to declare any interests
which became apparent in the course of discussions. He also reminded members of the need to register substantive gifts and hospitality offered and received in their Sport England roles, in line with prior correspondence from the Secretariat Team.

4. **Minutes of meeting of 20 June 2022**

4.1 The Board agreed the minutes of the meeting of 20 June 2022 (paper MB22-59) as a true record of discussions.

5. **Matters arising**

5.1 Board reviewed the Actions log and were content with progress, with the majority of actions having moved to ‘complete’ status since the last meeting or being addressed under later agenda items.

5.2 The Board had also dealt with the following items by correspondence:

a) details of System Partner funding conditions for the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB) for information and feedback (Paper MB22-53);

b) agreement of Funding for Women’s Rugby World Cup 2025 Legacy Programme (paper MB22-54);

c) approval of Exchequer award to SportsAid for the administration and management of the Diploma in Sporting Excellence (paper MB22-55);

d) approval of award to the Football Foundation to deliver a grass pitch improvement programme (paper MB22-55);

e) agreement of arrangements for relocation of Sport England London office (paper MB22-56).

6. **CEO update**

6.1 Tim Hollingsworth spoke to paper MB22-60.

6.2 The Board discussed staffing and transformation issues. It noted that while the volume of staff departures earlier in the year had slowed considerably, high inflation, low public sector wage growth and competition from more remunerative sectors continued to make recruitment challenging. This, along with a delayed London office move, the filling of key roles by interim staff, and the transition to a permanent hybrid working policy, meant that resourcing now presented as a substantial risk (and was dealt with as such within the risk register at item 13). The Board also noted a ramping-up of organisational transformation work, embracing leadership development, pay and grading
review, staff survey action plan; and broader transformation review facilitated by consultants Public Digital. (Transformation related risks were also logged in the risk register at item 13). Engagement with union representatives locally remained constructive. Nonetheless the wider national context of public sector pay disputes and some local concerns about the scope for flexibility afforded by the Government pay remit, escalated risk here also. London-based staff were currently transitioning to new premises at 10 South Colonnade, Canary Wharf with the lease for 21 Bloomsbury Street ending on 7 November 2022. The Board recognised that there would be a period of logistical and behavioural adjustment for London-based staff as they familiarised themselves with new and very different hybrid working arrangements in a shared office.

6.3 Board members noted the short update on Measurement and Evaluation, and the draft Measurement and Evaluation framework that had been discussed by Investment Committee. The Board welcomed progress here and felt that a Board ‘deep dive’ into the matter would be helpful Action
Nick Pontefract: to schedule for early Board discussion.

6.4 Board members noted also the updates in the paper on:

a) action during the official period of mourning for Queen Elizabeth II
b) the Quarter 1 Accountability Report to DCMS under its Framework Agreement with Sport England;
c) board member appointments;
d) plans for early engagement with Ministers in the new administration
e) ongoing Engagement with DCMS on the Government Sports Strategy
f) The NAO report on participation in sport (published 8 July), and oral evidence session to the Public Accounts Committee (31 October).
g) opportunities and risks of private equity Investment in sport, further to discussion by Investment Committee at its meeting of 7 September.
h) Chair and CEO meetings with key stakeholders.

7. **Addressing Cost of Living challenges**

7.1 Hazel McCluskey and Phil Smith introduced paper MB22-61 summarising Sport England’s short and medium-term external response to this live and rapidly escalating issue. The Board welcomed the cross-directorate approach adopted, noting the insight overview; the broad approach of coordinating, advocating, facilitating and providing; immediate actions in train or being put in place; medium term action planned; and the alignment of these responses to the Uniting the Movement Action Plan.
7.2 Members stressed the need for Sport England to be clear internally and externally about what it could and couldn’t do. They felt that officers should be wary of spreading efforts too thinly and bold about dialling down activity where necessary to respond to the crisis more effectively. Members highlighted the importance of clarity of mission; of maintaining focus on under-represented or challenged groups; and of building resilience and sustainability. Members noted that the differential impacts of rising costs would be complex and intersectional, but immediate disparities (notably around people with disabilities) were already clearly visible.

7.4 Board members were concerned by the scale and volatility of the issue (not least the potential ramifications of the recent Fiscal Event) and by the complexity of its indirect and knock-on effects. They noted that while costs to providers and consumers were – at least in principle – easier to quantify, effective and rapid assessment of impacts from reduced revenues and capacity to provide would be challenging.

7.5 Board members cited the impact on local leisure services, and the impacts on commercial income in specific sports, with consequent reductions in funds available to grassroot activity. They noted that any strategic intervention by Government was likely to be predicated on robust financial data. Sport England therefore needed to consider how best it might process (or stimulate the processing of) wider insight into the financial impacts on the sector and knock-on effects on participation levels, and to share this widely, including with government. In shaping its own interventions, however, Members recommended that Sport England should not seek to delay action while over-engineer its evidence base. It felt it likely that that there was enough substance in what was already known that officers could start to decide priorities, and resource actions to address them.

7.6 The Board supported ongoing liaison with DCMS and other Government departments to ensure awareness and understanding of the challenges faced and present solutions. It flagged the potential opportunity to catalyse innovative ways of working in the leisure sector with focus on decarbonisation and sustainability, including improving insulation and renewable energy sources. Notwithstanding some current parallels with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic The Board agreed that the Uniting the Movement implementation plan’s emphasis on tacking inequalities across the piece, suggested a targeted emergency fund was not yet appropriate,

7.7 The Board asked that officers take this feedback into consideration and
continue progressing short-term actions identified in the paper whilst keeping open options for exploring more immediate action including the potential for further direct funding support. It also asked officers to explore a medium-term response as part of the next steps for ‘Recover and Reinvent’. Action: Hazel McCluskey (with colleagues) to progress accordingly.

8. Sport Survival Package (SSP)

8.1 Lizzie Hughes updated on events since the last Board meeting (paper MB22-62). The Board noted the high-profile difficulties experienced within Premier League Rugby, most notably by Worcester Warriors. In addition to this short-term pressure there remained considerable uncertainty about the onward management of the SSP. This posed significant risks to the effective operation of SSP (including increasing stress on staff resources and retention); to Sport England’s reputation; and to the effective delivery of the wider Sport England programme.

8.2 The Board

a) commended the sterling work by hard pressed SE officers under conditions of stress and uncertainty, resolution of which lay largely outside Sport England’s control;

b) acknowledged the increasing challenges around SSP communications, given the complexity of the issues and scope for misunderstanding by commentators and potential investors, and the legal and sponsor constraints on communications. Nevertheless, it felt that officers were handling matters well.

c) noted that fundamental issues of policy around protecting investment versus protecting sport were now manifesting. While decisions here were clearly for Government, their ramifications would very much be felt being by Sport England as fund administrators. The contentious nature of decisions here in a context of wider debate about regulation and probity in sport meant that the rapid genesis of SSP, and its original emergency support purpose might easily become misrepresented.

d) was concerned that despite Sport England managing short term pressures well, and notwithstanding clarity of accountability and high-level responsibilities, the government-led transition to a long-term management solution for the fund appeared to have lost momentum. The Board was not comfortable that Government resources and capacity would be lined up in a timely manner to enable effective management of a hugely complex loan book and avoid knock-on
impacts of Sport England’s wider mission.

8.3 Chris Boardman thanked discussants and asked Adam Conant to relay the Board’s concerns to colleagues at DCMS.

9. **Whyte Review update**

9.1 Phil Smith spoke to paper MB22-63 which followed up the Board’s discussion of the findings of the Whyte review at its previous meeting. He reported that a joint Whyte Review Commissioning Bodies Response Group (WRCBRG) had now been established by Sport England and UK Sport to oversee the response to the Whyte Review. The WRCBRG had been in close contact with British Gymnastics to scrutinise and advise on its proposals and was, on balance, satisfied with progress and the level of commitment to positive change shown by the British Gymnastics Board and senior management.

9.2 The Board looked forward to further six-monthly progress reports from the WRCBRG. In the meantime, it was pleased that Sport England’s engagement with British Gymnastics and NGBs (including through system partner relationships) were facilitating conversations around potentially harmful coaching cultures. Additionally, across the sector sector, Sport England was engaged in the Review of safeguarding standards, Review of regional safeguarding, and further roll out and advocacy of the Code for Sports Governance.

10. **EDI report**

10.1 Rashmi Becker and Viveen Taylor spoke to paper MB22-64.

10.2 The Board noted and was content with the substantial progress on ‘external’ EDI work recorded.

10.2 Rashmi Becker updated on the internal EDI Group meeting of 20 September. She cited good work by HR on measurement and evaluation against progress but noted that Sport England had not yet fully recovered the intense organisational stresses of the COVID-19 period. Its efforts to diversify were challenged by the recruitment and pay constraints discussed at Item 6. It was all the more important, therefore, that Sport England stayed true to its own EDI aspirations, supporting and embedding them across its programmes with responsive and agile processes.
10.3 The Board welcomed sight of the DIAP overview and dashboard, noting that there had been much promising progress. However, Board members did not yet feel fully sighted on recruitment practice and outcomes. The Board suggested regular review of data on internal recruitment, including any in-system changes in candidate profile to identify where specific barriers or bias might lie. The profile of Sport England’s workforce needed to be assessed against wider population baseline (including perhaps the characteristics of the target audiences). Such review could include any self-imposed targets and rolling progress towards them. **Action: Nick Pontefract** to circulate EDIG paper and supporting benchmarking data and consider rolling dashboard style updates outside the Board meeting schedule.

10.4 The Board noted that Sport England was duly monitoring its gender pay gap and feeding this into its wider diversity monitoring and appraisal. While there was no equivalent legal requirement (and certain practical challenges) around pay gaps by ethnicity or other protected Characteristic, Sport England had initiated an ethnicity pay gap review.

11. **Finance matters**

11.1 Rachel Musson spoke to the Period 5 finance report (MB22-65). The Board:

a) noted the current forecast of an overall exchequer underspend of £391k (programme underspend of £477k, due mainly to lower staff costs due to vacancies, and administrative overspend of £85k, due to increased Temporary Staff Costs. Savings would need to be found here since it was not permitted to substitute programme spend for Administrative spend

b) was pleased that Lottery income continued to perform well into 2022-23 (total income for 2022-23 projects was £15m above budget at £235m) while acknowledging that a new lottery provider, and a cost of living crisis would make long term forecasting more difficult production;

c) noted that the Lottery award forecast, particularly Sport Development Spend, was behind the budgeted commitment rate, and further delays to commitments could impact longer term Lottery bank balance projections. Finance and programme teams had therefore implemented measures to monitor and manage impact on the Grant-in-aid Exchequer programme allocation;

d) was content overall with progress as reported.

11.2 Rachel Musson reported that due to the extended timetable to which NAO was working, the sign off point for Board on the Annual Report and Accounts
had moved back further. It was hoped that this point would coincide with
the provisional meeting slot already in members’ diaries for 7 November.
However, further delays might necessitate convention of a special meeting.

11.3 The Board noted that Audit Risk and Governance Committee had been
briefed on ongoing issues with the new Investment management system.

12. **Place Expansion, Progress and next steps**

12.1 Lisa Dodd Mayne, Joel Brookfield, Naomi Shearon and Lizzie Hughes
presented paper MB22–66. This presented analysis of insight, data,
evidence, and learning informing a draft framework for the place expansion
approach set out the 2022–25 *Uniting the Movement* implementation plan.
This framework had benefitted from discussion with staff across the
organisation, stakeholders and the Investment Committee. Strategic
steerage from the Board was now sought to ensure alignment on the scale
of ambition and for oversight of the main delivery risks. Board members
agreed that this was a timely point for input, given current cost of living
pressure; and supply-side pressures in a sector significantly altered by the
impacts of COVID and in places lacking resilience.

12.2 Board Members reviewed emerging outcomes, objectives, and parameters
guiding the practical design of the place expansion approach. The Board
acknowledged the need to balance pace of approach with robustness,
given the necessity for this potentially significant investment to be well
targeted, and methodologically robust. The Board felt that, overall, the
objectives, parameters and risk framework formed a sound basis for doing
so. A more user-focussed approach to communications could be
developed as the approach was operationalised.

12.3 Board members felt it telling that Sport England was only now finalising the
scaling up of its place-based work after a long local delivery pilot period. An
overarching learning point was that universally applicable solutions and
replicability had proved elusive. There were no ‘silver bullets’: context –
overlain social, economic, political and other characteristics of ‘place’ were
key. Nonetheless, there were core principles; success indicators; and
effective ways of working that could be drawn out, disseminated and
supported across the piece. Strong local support, active political leadership,
and coherence within consortia, for example, would be critical for sustained
success and multiplication of that success.
12.4 Board members provided feedback on funding: the overall funding envelope for this work, how it might be split between universal provision and specific investment in those areas that need it most; how Sport England could determine which areas had the greatest need; and how to prioritise these. The Board:

a) supported the principled proposition in the paper for 25% of Sport England organisational budget until 2031 to be directed to place partnerships (estimated currently at approx. £600M);

b) broadly supported the principle that at least 55% of all resource (expenditure and time) be allocated in areas defined as having the greatest need - but strongly recommended that the percentage of targeted investment to greatest need be increased significantly;

c) broadly supported the criteria set out in the paper for identifying ‘greatest need’ and looked forward to further iteration and information about how quantitative data will be supplemented with more qualitative judgements on success criteria based on what had already been learnt from the Local Delivery Pilots;

d) encouraged granular exploration on how and to whom resource was allocated in practice within geographical areas, such that a sensible balance could be achieved those already (or becoming) engaged and those who were marginalised;

e) highlighted the need for a clear correlation between funding and leadership capacity and drive, to get behind the people who could lead and sustain success on the ground. Officers could usefully consider further what ‘good leadership’ behaviour meant, and how it manifested.

f) stressed the importance of clear rationales for supporting (or not supporting) specific activities, along with robust monitoring mechanisms to monitor, and a process for stopping what was not working;

g) agreed that this needed to mesh with Sport England’s wider work on monitoring and evaluation. Board members acknowledged the challenges in unpicking the complex impacts of blanket support (and indeed targeted investments) and identifying causes and effects;

h) reflected on what ‘good looked like’, for example in situations where it cost more to reach people that are less engaged and active; or in terms of monitoring the quality of engagement (for example smaller groups of people with more complex needs).

12.5 The Board noted and was content with the elevated risks for delivery described in the paper. It recognised that there might be a need to sometimes invest ‘at the edge of Sport England’s remit’ (i.e. support for
activity or items not directed solely or directly to sport and physical activity) where such investment created the preconditions for advancing Sport England’s place-based objectives in the longer term. It was important that this was done in a controlled way, but Sport England should consider being more risk-hungry here, seeking support and clarity from DCMS where necessary on ‘grey areas’.

12.6 The Board felt that, in principle, Board-level championship of place-based working would be helpful, and asked officers to explore this further as plans crystallised, and new Board members were appointed.

12.7 The Board noted the importance of progressing work here in alignment with the Government’s agenda for delivering growth across the country. Remaining close to DCMS and to other National Lottery distributors would be important. At the same time, the Board emphasised that the distinctiveness and value-added of sport and physical activity to this agenda should not be lost. Sport England work should actively support others’ wider agendas, but should not be dictated by them.

12.8 Chris Boardman thanks discussants and officers for their work to date. At its December meeting, the Board looked forward to a more detailed delivery options for place expansion **Action: Lisa Dodd Mayne** to progress in line with Board feedback

13. **Strategic Risk review**

13.1 Lynsey Tweddle introduced paper **MB22-67**.

13.2 Board reviewed the Risk Strategy presented and were content that it remained a robust basis for risk management in the organisation.

13.3 The Board reviewed the corporate risk register and supporting external risk factors document, focusing its discussion on internal risks around Structural and personnel changes; resources; internal operating environment and Internal policies, practices and processes (strategic risks 2 to 5). Board members reflected on resourcing challenges, and in particular the limited action that could be taken with regard to pay rates. The Board acknowledged that unlike commercial organisations, Sport England remained highly constrained by Government pay remit considerations and there were limited ways to be creative within these constraints. Equally, the conditions applying to Exchequer and Lottery funding gave little room to
manoeuvre. Potential government asks for ALBs to reduce administrative spend would exacerbate these challenges.

13.4 The Board:

a) was content that Sport England was exercising sensible flexibility within its pay remit parameters. It was pleased that the Whitley Council relationship was being conducted in a constructive manner, and was supportive of peripheral incentives such as a mobile benefits platform;

b) discussed possible scope for certain functions linked closely to delivery on the ground, to be carried out by trusted partner organisations rather than in house. A longer arm-length relationship with partners on programme monitoring and evaluation for example, was in-line with Uniting the Movement aspirations (as exemplified in System Partnerships and the Together Fund). The Board felt, however, that the scope for devolving Sport England’s core functions was otherwise limited and to do so could well be counterproductive (no net savings; loss of corporate knowledge, impacts on ‘Brand Sport England’ and distortion of markets);

c) supported ongoing Transformation-related discussions on the scale and focus of Sport England’s work, and the need to develop leaner models of managing this where appropriate;

d) emphasised the importance of open discussion with the sponsor department with a view to both sides being ‘comfortable about being uncomfortable’ under exceptional circumstances;

e) felt that seeking identification of effective mitigation for these risks required a high degree of granularity. Given that competition with organisations who could offer more favourable pay packages was a public-sector wide issue, Sport England needed to be really clear about where pressure points lay and how and why the pull to other organisations was stronger.

13.5 Overall, the Board was supportive of the ways risks were conceptualised and on the mitigations in place. Board members thanked officers for the clear and logical presentation it provided. They recognised that Sport England continued to work in a high-risk environment. The current situation amplified rather than undermined the mission set out in Uniting the movement. The Board suggested that Sport England’s approach:

a) should focus disproportionately on mitigating those risks where it had most control. The extreme operating circumstances dictated acknowledgement and preparedness for living with the consequences
of other risks as they crystallised. A clear honest narrative internally and externally about what Sport England reasonably could and couldn’t do was important;

b) consider further the risk appetite for specific risks, and the counter-factual longer-term impacts of not taking riskier action now;

c) look upstream for solutions: for example, encouraging projects to be designed in a way that facilitates the throughput of funding with less staff resource;

c) ensure that risk and opportunity management was embedded in Sport England’s ‘business as usual’. Current mitigations set out in the register were a sound basis but needed to be kept live and used formatively as well as summatively. Proactive as well as reactive measures would be required.

13.6 **Action: Lynsey Tweddle** to take forward.

14. **System Partners**

14.1 Ed Sandham introduced paper MB22–68. The Board noted prior decisions made in relation to (i) approving the total allocation of funding for potential system partners (paper MB21–47); (ii) Approving a limited Track 4 of 6 additional partners (paper MB22–12); (iii) completion of Phase 1 of the investment process. (MB22–42 refers). Of the six partners identified under Track four, four had now completed the investment process and were now brought to the Board for decision.

14.3 The Board **AGREED** system partnership funding for Special Olympics GB of £1,528,000 over 4 years from April 2023 in the terms set out in the paper.

14.4 The Board **AGREED** System Partnership funding for the Royal Mencap Society of £2,754,174 over 4 years and 3 months in the terms set out in the paper.

14.5 The Board (with Rashmi Becker abstaining) **AGREED** system partnership funding for Sense of £2,281,436 (an increase in the total form that originally solicited) over 4 years from April 2023 in the terms set out in the paper.

14.6 In supporting these awards, the Board:

a) noted the increased demand for more intensive support from stakeholders due to the disproportionately impacts of the pandemic and current economic stresses on and for many disabled people.
b) was pleased that among matters evaluated in making these recommendations had been: avoiding duplication of existing services; scrutiny, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms; the likely value provided by partners beyond simple numbers of participants; and sustainability and legacy.

c) noted that disability and care provision was fragmented and localised, and that even this substantial support represented only a small proportion of the sector. It emphasised the connecting and supportive roles of system partners across the piece, with a particular role for the Activity Alliance and for Active Partnerships.

14.7 The Board DEFERRED AGREEMENT of a System Partnership award to Swim England until its December meeting to allow for progress around that body’s safeguarding and complaints procedures, and for clear and robust award conditions to be put in place. The Board underlined the importance of system partners going beyond procedural improvements on safeguarding and complaints, to address working cultures and behaviours.

14.8 The Board was content that British Rowing and Pentathlon GB remain under consideration as Track 4 system Partners while undergoing internal and leadership changes. The Board was happy to consider proposals for funding, if appropriate, when these were complete.

14.9 The Board was also content that British Taekwondo and the British Taekwondo Council (both of which provided governing and systemic roles for the sport) be invited to take part in the system partners process concluding in March 2023.

15. Commonwealth Games England

15.1 Phil Smith introduced paper MB22-69, setting out proposals for Commonwealth Games England revenue funding including contributions to delivery costs associated with (i) the preparation and presentation of Team England for the 2026 Commonwealth Games to be staged in Victoria, Australia; (ii) the forthcoming 2023 Commonwealth Youth Games in Trinidad and Tobago and a possible Commonwealth Youth Games in 2025.

15.2 The Board noted prior discussions (Paper MB22-45 refers). In line with the Board’s asks, the present proposals had been developed in a manner similar to that required of full system partners. The Board considered:

a) the systemic role of Commonwealth Games England;
b) its commitment to exemplifying and taking forward *Uniting the Movement* principles by developing and delivering a more accessible, inclusive and diverse talent and high-performance system;

c) The success, in these terms, of the recent Birmingham 2022 Commonwealth Games;

a) Legal and governance issues discussed in the paper.

15.3 The Board **APPROVED** an award of £6,000,000 to Commonwealth Games England for Commonwealth Games England revenue funding for a four year period from April 2023 to March 2027 as set out in the paper. **Action:** Duncan Truswell to progress award arrangements accordingly.

16. **Hockey Loans**

16.1 Nick Boulter introduced proposals set out in paper MB22-70 for Sport England investment in support of a new Hockey Impact Fund. This would use a loan finance model to support 50 to 60 capital projects improving and creating new hockey facilities also capable of supporting multi-sport opportunities.

16.2 The Board discussed and:

a) noted prior discussion and support by the Investment Committee;

b) felt that the operating model was sound and robustly costed. It asked, however, for updated costings before final approval, with due mitigations to further mitigate risks exacerbated by the current economic situation and rising interest rates;

c) was very supportive of the principle of enabling England Hockey to accelerate roll out of its ED&I plans for increased reach and accessibility to key target audiences, which had proved challenging for the sport in the past;

c) felt that hockey was an appropriate test bed for this approach. There was significant interest from the sport in expanding and diversifying its current participation base, and it was a good example of Sport England seeking to progress *Uniting the Movement*’s ‘innovative ways to invest’ catalyst. Board members noted provisional interest from other sports;

d) asked for particular attention to metrics assessing fund outputs and outcomes as proposals were taken forward, and for these to be linked to the release of funding. It was important that conditions were clear and offered a degree of stretch, and that England Hockey was empowered to them to lever change within clubs and user groups.
16.3 The Board therefore APPROVED up to £6m of lottery investment to support the new Hockey Impact Fund, using a loan finance model to support c50 to 60 capital projects to improve hockey/multisport facilities as set out in the paper. **Action: Nick Boulter** to note Board feedback and progress award accordingly.

16.4 The Board noted DCMS interest in this innovative approach, and asked officers to share with DCMS its assumptions and intelligence around the operating model, include around returns on loans, likely write-offs, financial implications for clubs amid rising prices **Action: Nick Boulter**

**Any Other Business**

17.1 Chris Boardman flagged two upcoming decisions by correspondence.

a) Investment Committee would be asked to agree proposals related to GB Archery and the Royal British Legion 'Battle back' programme’ at the Lilleshall National Sports Centre.

b) Board would be asked to agree to progress the recognition of kickboxing as a sport and WAKO-GB as its recognised NGB.

17.2 Chris Boardman asked members to be ready to meet again on the provisionally scheduled slot on 7 November. It was likely that at least some of this time would be required for formal Board business, including Annual Report and Accounts sign off. It also provided an opportunity to welcome and onboard any new members should appointments have been confirmed at that point.

17.3 Three information only papers had also been made available to members:  
**MB21-71: Board effectiveness review and induction framework update; MB22-72: Summary note of September Investment Committee Meeting; and MB22-73 Summary note of September ARGC Meeting.** No issues were raised with these.

17.4 With no further items of business being raised, Chris Boardman thanked discussants and closed the meeting. The meeting would be followed by a short debrief session for members and CEO only.

[Minutes agreed by the Board at its meeting of 12 December 2022]