

Minutes of the Sport England Board meeting of 28 March 2023

10 South Colonnade, Canary Wharf London E14 5EA and remote joining via Teams

Members Chris Boardman, Chair

Rashmi Becker
Mel Bound
Michelle Cracknell
Jason Fergus
David Mahoney
Tove Okunniwa
Helene Raynsford

Officers Jeanette Bain-Burnett – ED, Policy and Integrity Emma Bernstein– Strategic Projects Lead (item 12) Joel Brookfield –Strategic Lead, Local Delivery (item 11) Kate Dale – Director, Campaigns Lisa Dodd-Mayne – ED, Place Sarah Forster – Director, Finance (items 9 and 10) Lizzie Hanna – Chief Financial Officer Tim Hollingsworth – Chief Executive Officer Richard Mabbitt – Board Secretary Simon Macqueen – Director, Strategy Rachel Musson – Interim Chief Financial Officer Nick Pontefract – Chief Strategy Officer Adam Rigarlsford – Strategic Lead, B2022 (item 12) Phil Smith – ED, Partnerships Ed Sandham – Strategic Lead, Active Partnerships (item 11) Naomi Shearon – Strategic Lead, Strategy (item 11) Viveen Taylor –Director, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion James Vickery – Consultant (Item 14)

Guests Katherine Grainger – Chair, UK Sport Simon Mason – Head of Sport Strategy, DCMS

Introductory items

1. Chair's welcome / introduction

- 1.1 Chris Boardman welcomed Board members (including new members Mel Bound, Michelle Cracknell, Jason Fergus, and Helen Raynsford) and attending staff. He felt there was now a good blend of skills and experiences on the Board, and was pleased that vacancies on Committees and other

key non-executive roles had been filled satisfactorily. Nonetheless, the Board remained small in number and discussions continued with DCMS about further strengthening its membership.

- 1.2 Chris Boardman welcomed Katherine Grainger, who as UK Sport Chair periodically observed Sport England meetings, and Simon Mason who was attending on behalf of DCMS.

2. Apologies for absence

- 2.1 All members were in attendance.

3. Declarations of interest

- 3.1 No interests were declared additional to those already registered. **Action: Richard Mabbitt** to circulate consolidated register of interests.
- 3.2 The Board noted Jason Fergus's role as CEO of Active Essex, but agreed that this did not preclude him from full participation in the strategic-level discussion at item 11. However, for future proposals brought to the Board relating specifically to Essex (particularly those with direct funding implications) his recusal would be needed. The Board also noted Tim Hollingsworth's role as a member of the Board of the Football Foundation, which body was to be discussed at item 19. Given he was not part of the board and had no vote on the matter, the Board was content that he attended for this item.

4. Minutes of the meeting of 12 December 2022

- 4.1 Minutes of the last meeting (MB23-08) were **AGREED** by those members who had attended, with agreement having been secured separately from recently departed members.

5. Matters arising

- 5.1 Board reviewed the Actions Log (MB23-09).
- 5.2 Phil Smith gave an oral update on actions relating to the National Governing Body recognitions of Paddleboarding and Kickboxing.
- 5.3 The Board was content overall with progress as reported, including the agreement by correspondence since the last meeting, of proposals on:

- a) Sport & Physical Activity for Young People: Collaborative Fund – London. (Paper [MB22-98](#) refers)
- b) Audit, Risk & Governance Committee IM appointments ([MB23-01](#))
- c) Sports Council Trust Company Trustee appointments ([MB23-02](#))
- d) NGB Recognition: paddleboarding ([MB23-03](#))
- e) Investment Committee: independent member extension ([MB23-04](#))
- f) Lilleshall National Sports Centre: archery procurement ([MB23-05](#))
- g) Football facilities partnership ([MB23-06](#))
- h) Member deployment to committees and non-exec roles ([MB23-07](#))

6. CEO update

- 6.1 Tim Hollingsworth welcomed new Board members, on behalf of Sport England staff. He also welcomed Lizzie Hanna to her first meeting and thanked Rachel Musson for her sterling service as interim Chief Financial Officer. He reported the appointment of Ben Wilson as Executive Director for Digital Marketing and Communications, and that Kate Dale was providing cover until his arrival in May.
- 6.2 Board members noted:
 - a) that Sport Englands operating environment remained busy and dynamic, and this was reflected in the day's full agenda;
 - b) progress on the delayed DCMS / Sport England Framework document and discussions ongoing with DCMS about proportionate scrutiny of lottery distributors' funding decisions;
 - c) the update provided on measurement and accountability. Board members were encouraging of work to further refine a reporting dashboard;
 - d) updates for information on: National Audit Office and Public Accounts Committee Recommendations relating to grassroots participation in sport and physical activity; the Sports Survival Package; Sport England's leadership behaviours model; and Chair and CEO stakeholder engagements.

7. UK Sport Chair's update

- 7.1 Katherine Grainger spoke on the mutually supportive roles of UK Sport and Sport England and highlighted UK Sport priorities: winning and winning well; thriving sporting systems; and improving impact.
- 7.2 Board members reflected with Katherine Grainger on the increasing

challenges for executive leadership in sport and the potential for non-executive support here. They felt this would be a useful topic to return to, in the context of Sport England's ongoing transformation work. **Action: Tim Hollingsworth** to consider opportunities for this.

8. EDI report

8.1 Rashmi Becker and Viveen Taylor spoke to paper MB23-11.

8.2 On internal diversity and inclusion, Board members:

- a) reiterated the importance of Sport England itself 'being the change'. The Board was pleased with the internal diversity and inclusion actions Sport England was talking (including learning from TRARIS, and work toward Disability Confident Leader (Level 3) status), but stressed the need to normalise and habituate positive behaviour (moving from 'head' to 'heart' to 'hands');
- b) acknowledged there was a balance to be struck between initiating new activities and properly embedding ongoing actions;
- c) looked forward to discussing internal diversity further at the June meeting, focusing on recruitment (including diversity targets) as part of a bigger picture of a diverse and effective workforce;
- d) remained keen that that EDI as a theme was neither siloed nor was lost in shared ownership, suggesting that ELT goal setting offered opportunity to clarify responsibilities and leadership roles here

8.3 **Action: Nick Pontefract** to take Board feedback and EDI champion views into account in progressing this agenda item at the next Board meeting.

8.4 In terms of external EDI work, Board members

- a) were content with progress on the Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Consultation being undertaken by 'Better Decisions Together'.
- b) acknowledged the importance of work being undertaken to embed Transgender inclusion in domestic sport guidance in the National Governing Body landscape.
- c) noted work being carried out on the implementation of the National Disability Strategy; the National Autism Strategy; the Government Disability Action Plan; and investment responding to the challenges of sectoral recovery and reinvention for disabled people.

9. Finance report

9.1 Rachel Musson and Lizzie Hanna introduced the Finance report to 28

February (paper [MB23-12](#)) which had been reviewed in detail by the Audit Risk and Governance Committee (ARGC) at its meeting of 21 March 2023.

- 9.2 As ARGC Chair, Michelle Cracknell provided commentary, flagging the potential for streamlining ARA preparation, the criticality of progress towards an Investment Processing System (to be discussed further at item 14) solution, and the need for Board to be clear about organisational risk appetites.
- 9.3 On Exchequer funding, Board members noted that that although total underspend was currently within tolerances, it was anticipated that some admin and programme spend would not meet forecast. This was being monitored to avoid impacting on Grant-in-Aid allocations. Board members noted Lottery income, Lottery cost target and Lottery award forecast figures as set out in the paper.
- 9.4 The Board was content overall with the situation as reported.

10. **2023-24 Budget and lottery cash flow**

- 10.1 Rachel Musson, Lizzie Hanna and Sarah Forster introduced paper [MB23-13](#), which presented for the Board's approval the 2023-24 budget with financial projections for Lottery income and cash flow, and also presented the 3-year medium-term financial plan. The paper had also been reviewed in detail by ARGC at its meeting of 21 March 2023.
- 10.2 Board members noted the budget principles and constraints of our Exchequer funding and Lottery cost target within which the budget had been developed. Business Planning work for 2023-24 would be finalised by the end of May with any changes to align the Business Plan with the Budget carried out under the Forecasting process undertaken by the Finance team throughout the year, and presented in the quarterly Finance Report. The Board noted and was content with the presentation of Income, award commitments and operational budgets; and of Lottery current position and cash flow future planning; and the 3-year Medium-Term Financial Plan (including how inflation had been accounted for)
- 10.2 Board **APPROVED** the 2023-24 budget set out in the paper. In so approving, the Board noted ongoing work on business planning and transformation. Action: **Lizzie Hanna and Nick Pontefract** to progress business planning, keeping the Board aware of progress.

11. Expanding our place partnerships

- 11.1 Lisa Dodd-Mayne, Joel Brookfield, Ed Sandham and Naomi Shearon presented papers MB23-14 and MB23-14A. These proposed an overall approach and funding envelope for Sport England's work to expand place-based partnerships over the next five years, including principles for identifying those places. The proposals had been informed by feedback from the Board's 'deep dive' into place expansion of 28 February 2023 (summarised at paper MB23-29).
- 11.2 The Board **SUPPORTED** the broad approach proposed of: (i) Growth through Local Delivery Pilots; (ii) Supercharging through Active Partnerships; and (iii) a 'Universal offer' for Place Based Support. The Board recognised that in practice there would be overlap between (i) and (ii) in specific places but felt that this (if well-managed) would be a positive. The Board also acknowledged that different places would require a different blend of revenue and capital investment, and the need for Sport England to manage this carefully to avoid duplication of resources.
- 11.3 The Board **AGREED** an overall award envelope of £250m, over the next five years, to expand place-based partnerships to 80-100 additional places via the existing network of Local Delivery Pilots and Active Partnerships, alongside a 'universal offer' that all places (and other partners) can benefit from. The Board was content that subsequent investment decisions within the agreed overall envelope would be made under Sport England's investment decision-making framework, thereby being formally agreed by Board, Investment Committee or Executive Leadership Team depending on the amount and nature of expenditure.
- 11.4 In agreeing this approach and overall funding envelope, the Board:
- a) reiterated the importance of systematic measurement and evaluation linked to *Uniting the Movement* objectives. Being able to construct persuasive narratives for different audiences around "what success looked like" in different places was key. It was recognised that Place based work offered opportunities to exemplify best practice here.
 - b) was keen to see genuine and sustainable support and sharing of learning between different places, rather than further separate success stories.
 - c) Felt it was important to ensure that wider sport England programmes (such as talent pathways, and a sustainable facilities base) were developed in a way that meant local work and national agendas were

mutually supportive. It noted the role of digital approaches in mobilising and enabling community-based action.

- d) recognised the value of learning through failure and it asked for ongoing consideration of the risk appetite for dealing with new partners, of varying characteristics.
- e) felt that greater clarity about the pace of implementation, would be helpful, and asked for further consideration of these matters.

11.5 The Board felt that the prioritisation methodology around areas of greatest need was sound and evidence based. However, Board members reflected also on the need to factor in likelihood of impact, which was itself dependent on the engagedness and buy-in of local leaders to *Uniting the Movement* principles. The Board **AGREED** that recommendations on specific areas to invest in should be steered by the 'greatest need' index presented in the paper, **SUBJECT TO** this being overlain by an assessment of likelihood of impact, including local leadership ambition and capability.

11.6 **Action: Lisa Dodd-Mayne** to take forward in line with board decisions and feedback above with a progress report at the June Board meeting

11.7 The Board also noted the Place Expansion Capital Investment Strategy & 2023/24 Transition Plan summarised at Annex 3 of the paper, and agreed to consider a Stage 2 Business Case providing further detail on how the transition funding and resources will be deployed in 2023-24. **Action: Lisa Dodd-Mayne** to revert to Board in April

12. **Sport England / West Midlands Combined Authority Memorandum of Understanding**

12.1 Adam Rigarsford spoke to paper MB23-15, which proposed building on the successes of the Birmingham 2022 Commonwealth Games (B2022) by develop a stronger relationship with the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) to be embodied in a memorandum of understanding.

12.2 The Board felt that a place-specific memorandum was not inconsistent with the wider approach to place-based working discussed in the previous item. Rather, the specific local circumstances (high levels of deprivation, health inequalities and inactivity) combined with the legacy opportunity of B2022 created a propitious set of circumstances for advancing this partnership. The Board noted that the existing memorandum with Greater Manchester Combined Authority had already proved helpful in delivering positive change on shared local outcomes. The Board was also supportive of the initial proposal

of a £2.5m investment to leverage the B2022 contingency budget for sport and physical activity in the West Midlands with options for longer term co-investment in line with priorities to be agreed in the memorandum.

- 12.4 The Board therefore **ENDORSED** the development of a memorandum of understanding between Sport England and the WMCA. The Board **DELEGATED** to the CEO the decision (based on a future funding application) of an initial investment of up to £2.5m to leverage further investment for Sport and Physical Activity through the B2022 Contingency Investment programme s set out in the paper. **Action: Lisa Dodd Mayne / Adam Rigarlsford** to progress accordingly

13. Swimming Pool Support Fund

- 13.1 Kevin Mills and Emma Bernstein spoke to paper MB23-16 and briefed on the Swimming Pool Support Fund announced in the Chancellor's Spring Budget. This £63.3m support package for public swimming pools in England during 2023/24 aimed to provide immediate relief to pools at risk of closure due to energy prices. It also comprised longer term investment aimed at making facilities more sustainable, energy-efficient, and resilient to future energy cost pressures. The budgets included funding for the administration of the investment, to be handled by Sport England.
- 13.2 The Board **SUPPORTED** these developments and felt that they reflected well on Sport England, not just as a trusted delivery partner for government, but in terms of the insight and support provided to DCMS in preparing its submission to HMT, including *Moving Communities* data. They thanked officers for their proactivity and commitment.
- 13.3 The Board noted that the discussions had latterly prompted suggestions that complementary commitments from Sport England itself to invest in sustainable improvements to public sector swimming pools would further bolster the case being made to HMT. The latter stages of the negotiations had been fluid and fast-paced, so Sport England's provisional proposal (a £20m capital fund should HMT confirm the wider investment package) had therefore been discussed so far by ELT, CEO and Chair rather than full Board. The Board acknowledged that Sport England officers had needed to be responsive to events and were pleased that the organisation had reacted nimbly to the opportunity arising. The Board welcomed the principle of investment in sustainable solutions (such as those exemplified in the paper) and the long-term benefits this would bring. It felt this was congruent with the arguments for structural change in the sector set out in

The Future of Public Leisure and that lessons from the National Leisure Recovery Fund could be usefully applied.

- 13.5 The Board therefore **APPROVED** £20m of Sport England capital lottery funding to complement the Swimming Pool Support Fund with the aim of increasing the portfolio of swimming facilities that are more energy efficient. **Action Kevin Mills** to progress
- 13.5 The Board noted that resource for wider fund administration, while agreed in principle was the subject of full DCMS business case to HMT. Nonetheless, it was anticipated that a proportion of the revenue budget would be allocated to Sport England to procure a consultancy to cover grant administration support (along the lines of the National Leisure Recovery Fund). The Board was content that a Business Case be put to Investment Committee (seeking provisional agreement, if so necessitated by delays in HMT budget approval) on the appointment of a consultant. **Action: Kevin Mills** to progress

14. Investment Processing System

- 14.1 Rachel Musson and James Vickery introduced paper MB23-17. This set out proposals for the urgent replacement of Sport England's legacy Grant Management System, including the Great Plains finance system. These IT systems were obsolescent, increasingly expensive to operate and at risk of failure, and that Sport England required a new solution to deliver this core part of its mission. Beyond the need to ensure business continuity, the right new system would offer stability, certainty, and improved efficiency and working environment.
- 14.2 The Board discussed the Investment Processing System approach presented, which represented a significant departure from previous attempts to identify and procure a grants management solution. Its scope was tighter (being focused purely on the processing of investments); it sought a finished product (rather than 'design and build'); it explicitly emphasised business change (rather than product customisation); and had scoped all related activities (not just the purchase of a product).
- 14.3 Board members felt that new solutions could well offer opportunities to simplify and streamline process, and 'force' difficult-to-initiate positive behaviours and deliver efficiencies through more effective end-to-end working. Functionality supporting a more granular analysis of grant support to stakeholders would also be a benefit. In realising these opportunities there would, however, be practical and behavioural challenges around adapting established working practices to fit new solutions. Early user input

to the procurement and roll out phases was important, with well informed and decisive senior leadership and exemplification of cultural change.

- 14.4 The Board supported the scale and longevity of the proposals, given that processing a high volume of investments would always be fundamental to Sport England. It felt that in-contract updates and rolling improvements, would be far preferable to shorter term re-procurement or 'living with second best, and was pleased that the procurement process included a development road map. The Board was satisfied with the commercial approach adopted, with extensive peer research (other delivery bodies and central government) and market options. A number of products had been demonstrated as part of this, all of which appeared to offer significant advantages over the current systems.
- 14.4 The Board therefore **APPROVED** a total budget of **£3,150,750** for an Investment Processing System and the procurement of a commercial off-the-shelf grant product and related services to implement and support the solution. **Action: Lizzie Hanna and James Vickery** to progress.

15. Swim England System Partnership

- 15.1 Emma Forward and Phil Smith introduced paper MB23-18, on System Partner investment into Swim England to support tackling inequalities across aquatic sports, with a specific focus on accessibility and increasing the diversity of participants and the workforce.
- 15.2 Board Members discussed the role of swimming in reducing inactivity and promoting more active lifestyles, given the high levels of participation in swimming as a sport and as a leisure activity. There remained challenges around participation by culturally diverse communities and those from lower socio-economic groups which the National Governing body was key to addressing. Swim England had clearly set out its intent and action planning to tackle inequalities.
- 15.2 The Board discussed the context for the delayed decision, and the importance of good governance in making sure that wider aspirations for swimming as a welcoming, safe, and inclusive sport were met in practice. The Board noted that Swim England, in its *Heart of Aquatics* action plan, had started to address the recommendations of both the Sport England - commissioned review conducted by Sport Resolutions UK, and (ii) the Child Protection in Sport Unit annual review of compliance against standards for safeguarding children in sport. While pleased by this commitment, and by

officers increased confidence in Swim England's ability to deliver meaningful progress, the Board was also mindful that actions and processes needed to be accompanied by cultural change at all levels of the sport. It therefore agreed that at this stage any award needed to be heavily conditioned, with longer term funding conditional upon defined action and demonstrable improvements.

15.4 The Board therefore **AGREED** to one year system partner funding to Swim England, firmly set against agreed conditions **of £3,341,110** deliver their emerging strategy 'Access Aquatics' through their governing, systemic, delivery and talent roles.

15.5 The Board **AGREED IN PRINCIPLE** for funding for years two to four of £7,240,490, that award being subject to satisfactory progress in year 1, and to specific conditions and ongoing monitoring.

16. National Governing Body (NGB) recognition: British Ju-jitsu Association GB (BJJAGB)

16.1 With three recognition items coinciding on the agenda, Phil Smith reminded members of the rationale and overall process for Sport England, its counterparts in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, and UK Sport, in recognising Sports and national governing bodies. Members noted in particular the criterion for uniqueness in justifying whether a sport should be recognised separately, and the technical and cultural aspects of uniqueness that needed to be considered here.

16.2 The Board firstly considered the recommendation of the Sports Councils' UK Officer Recognition Panel (UKRP) in respect of the BJJAGB. Board members noted that this recommendation was on the basis of a formal Recognition Review of BJJAGB's compliance against the NGB criteria, which had required BJJAGB to submit information for assessment in much the same way as if it were applying for recognition.

16.3 The Board noted that:

- a) Sport England had no powers to sanction or shut-down NGBs, beyond derecognition and the withdrawal or cessation of funding linked to recognition. In this case, BJJAGB was not a Sport England system partner and was not in receipt of Sport England investment.
- b) the *sport* of ju-jitsu (as opposed to the NGB) would continue to be recognised by the Sports Councils. With no recognised NGB, however, ju-jitsu projects would not be eligible to apply for Sport England funding.
- c) Sport England was not constituted as a regulatory body, but was

sometimes perceived as such. It was therefore important that its role (and those of the other Sports Councils) in sports governance was communicated clearly in cases such as this.

- 16.4. Noting that parallel consideration of this matter by the Boards of the other Sports Councils was anticipated over April, the Board **AGREED** the recommendation that BJJAGB be de-recognised as an NGB, unless able to demonstrate full compliance with the recognition criteria within eight weeks. **Action: Richard Clarkson** to progress in line with other Sports council's recommendations

17. NGB recognition: England Touch

- 17.1 Secondly, Phil Smith spoke to paper MB23-20 which, in line with UKRP recommendations, sought recognition for touch rugby (or 'touch') to be recognised as a sport and for England Touch to be recognised as the Sport's NGB in England.
- 17.2 The Board discussed the 'uniqueness' justification for separate recognition of touch on both technical and cultural grounds. It noted the multiple variations between touch rugby and both rugby league and rugby union in how the game was played and managed.
- 17.3 The Board discussed the risk of duplication and overlap of NGB roles and the importance of maintaining effective working relationship between touch and the RFU and RFL were maintained. It noted that whilst rugby union and rugby league both delivered touch rugby, separate well established national and international governing and delivery structures existed for the sport.
- 17.4 The Board therefore **AGREED** the recommendation that touch rugby be recognised as a sport, with England Touch recognised as an NGB in England alongside the RFU and RFL. **Action: Richard Clarkson** to progress.
- 17.5 The Board was interested in the opportunities for disabled participants in touch rugby, as opposed to other rugby codes (**Action: Phil Smith** to check and report back)

18. NGB recognition: Walking Football Association

- 18.1 Thirdly, Phil Smith introduced paper MB23-21. Board members reflected on the outcome of the UKRP assessment, and agreed with its recommendation

that walking football was not a unique activity and should be considered as a variation or adaptation of association football. Board members noted that the Football Association was the recognised NGB for association football, and that Sport England was investing in its Walking Football Gameplan as part of the existing system partner relationship. They agreed that these factors, taken alongside the Football Association's existing influence in walking football, and its role in the wider football landscape, supported that case that the Football Association should be the National Governing Body that Sport England should continue to work with.

- 18.2 Board therefore **AGREED** the recommendation that the Walking Football Association's application to recognise walking football as a sport, and for WFA to be recognised as its NGB is to be turned down. **Action: Richard Clarkson** to progress

19. Football Facilities Investment 2023-25

- 19.1 Pat Brosnan briefed the board on paper MB23-22, which sought the Board's formal agreement to the 'passporting' of targeted Exchequer investment towards football facilities through the Football Foundation. He reported the Foundation's strong delivery model now in place and good progress against funding objectives, including multisport support and increasing inclusion. The Board had already agreed to enter into a partnership agreement with DCMS and the football foundation in respect of this funding relationship (paper MB23-06 refers)
- 19.2 The Board noted:
- a) opportunities being taken by the Foundation for collaborative work with key system partners including NGBs and Active Partnerships;
 - b) the potential for the work being funded here to support wider place-based approaches to increasing engagement in sport and physical activity, with a focus on delivering facilities in the most deprived areas;
 - c) that the Foundation had acted effectively in relation to a suspected fraud case identified within its small grants programme. The risk of fraud on larger capital remained small due to close and well-managed relationships between Football Foundation and established partners and extensive use of frameworks.
- 19.3 The Board therefore **APPROVED** the targeted Exchequer investment towards football facilities for 2023-25 (2023-24: £18m GiA and Up to £63m UK wide multi sports facilities funding. 2024-25 £18m GiA and up to £59m UK-

wide sports facilities funding) **SUBJECT TO** final government approval as set out in the paper. **Action: Pat Brosnan** to progress

20. Any other business

- 20.1 Board members reviewed proposals for Year two funding for the 2025 Women's Rugby World Cup legacy programme, set out in MB23-22A, brought as a late paper for conditional agreement due to delays in securing formal settlement from DCMS
- 20.2 Having in mind earlier discussion at Board on this matter (prior paper MB22-54 had been circulated also for members information) the Board was content with arrangements in hand for the onward 'passporting' of exchequer funding (£2,200,000 Revenue; and £2,640,000 Capital) to the rugby football union. The Board therefore **APPROVED** the award of £4,840,000 to the Rugby Football Union for the Women's Rugby World Cup 2025 Legacy Programme in 2023/24. **SUBJECT TO** receiving a formal Settlement Letter from DCMS for Year 2 funding, which was anticipated shortly. The Board also **DELEGATED** to the CEO future in-principle funding decisions in relation to the 2025 Women's Rugby World Cup legacy programme. **Action: Nick Pontefract and Special Projects Team** to progress
- 20.3 Tove Okunniwa asked for details of the *BBC Woman's Hour Power List: Women in Sport 2023* to be circulated. **Action: Richard Mabbitt**
- 20.5 Tim Hollingsworth flagged Sport England involvement in the *Big Help Out* volunteering campaign that was a major flagship initiative around the coronation of King Charles III.
- 20.6 Minutes of Committee, subsidiary, and other meetings (Papers MB22-23 to MB22-38) circulated for information only had been duly noted by members.
- 20.7 The next meeting, on 18 April 2023 was currently scheduled as a largely informal networking and briefing meeting, with a short formal session bolted on to deal with any 'overspill' items of business.
- 20.8 With no further matters of business being raised, Chris Boardman thanked attendees and closed the meeting: The meeting would be followed by a short 'wash-up' session for members and CEO only.

These minutes were agreed by the Board at its meeting of 28 June 2023