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WELCOME

1. Apologies were noted for Board members Kate Bosomworth, Ian Cumming and Karen Pickering. Members had provided the Chairman with commentary on items of business which he would reflect at the appropriate points during the meeting.

2. Debbie Jevans was expected to return from sabbatical from her role at Sport England in the new year. Wasim Khan had been appointed as Managing Director of the Pakistan Cricket
Board (based in Pakistan) and would therefore be stepping down from his role on the Sport England Board.

3. There were no declarations of interest.

4. The minutes of the Board meeting held on 1 November 2018 were APPROVED as a correct record.

5. The Board NOTED the Matters Arising from the Board meeting on 1 November 2018 and earlier meetings, all of which had been completed, carried forward or dealt with elsewhere on the Board’s agenda.

CEO REPORT

6. This was TH’s first official Board meeting following his appointment as CEO on 19 November 2018. TH set out his initial reflections on some of the key internal and external issues for the organisation and his three main areas of focus, described as Ambition, Activation and Advocacy. TH highlighted current positive activity and the areas for development within each work strand, for example, greater clarity on what Sport England is doing and being measured on and being structurally ready for the challenges ahead (Ambition); how Sport England is activating, pace and scale, and attitude to risk and willingness to try new things (Activation); and developing culture and values that fully support delivery of the strategy, both internally and working with partners, and empowering decision-making (Advocacy).

7. TH described some of the tactical and structural areas of focus which included external relationships and advocacy, clarity on targets and ambition, and preparation for the Comprehensive Spending Review and developing an economic model for sport.

8. The Board welcomed TH’s initial reflections and looked forward to hearing from him again at future meetings.

Update on Legal Matters

9. ES updated the Board on two significant legal issues that had arisen over the last 12 months. The Sport England Audit, Risk & Governance Committee had been made aware of both matters and AL, in his capacity as Chair of the Committee, had been briefed in full throughout the handling of both. The Board had discussed both matters at its 1 November meeting; ES updated Board members on progress since then.

ES left the meeting.

COO REPORT

Strategy and Budget Report

10. Since the last performance report to the Board in September, progress against the targets and outcomes had continued with several of the Priority Groups meeting and colleagues scoping,
planning and delivering the individual tactics underpinning the Strategic Priorities. Following a request from Government to clearly articulate the major areas of focus, revisions had been made to the Major Disruptors, broadening the scope in a couple of examples and collating work on the Local Delivery Pilots and Active Environments under Place-Based working.

11. The Investment Committee had reviewed and discussed the performance report, and some themes had emerged, including the pace and volume of work internally. Work was underway to map out the next 12 months which would allow the Executive Team to consider the entire strategy portfolio of work and prioritise resource accordingly, particularly ensuring that resources were allocated where needed the most.

12. The Board discussed that Sport England’s current organisational culture and ‘default’ way of working made it more challenging to work innovatively and with an entrepreneurial approach. The Board asked about the nature of the barriers to organisational change i.e. whether these were structural or attitudinal in nature.

13. Sport England’s new ways of working required staff to think and operate differently (the ‘how’ rather than just the ‘what’ of delivery of the strategy). Cultural understanding of how to deliver the strategy was still developing. The organisation was actively implementing operational changes, however, some of the work was inherently riskier and could lead to a hesitancy to act for fear of making the wrong decision, resulting in colleagues reverting to the organisation’s decision-making bodies at more points, more often.

14. The Board discussed the need for the organisation to be given clear and practical guidance about how it needed to operate more innovatively, coupled with providing confidence in addressing indecision and the fear of failure. Furthermore, the Board encouraged the Executive Team and the business to be bolder in terms of setting out what is achievable and what isn’t within the limits of available resource and funding.

15. The Board reflected on the breadth of the strategy and what the organisation was seeking to achieve, and some of the uncertainty about the overarching aim for Sport England’s work i.e. whether this should be achievement and measurement against the targets or the five Government outcomes. Part of the organisation’s role was to make a strong and compelling case across the whole of the sport and physical activity sector and whilst it was important to have tangible, accessible targets to help change attitudes and drive behaviour change, the organisation also had to demonstrate the broader and more subtle influence of its investment through achievement of the outcomes. Developing a narrative which built understanding of the connection between the targets and outcomes as well as recognition of the broader impact of Sport England’s investment was needed to ensure the organisation was not inadvertently judged on one set of information only.

16. It was also highlighted that whilst the role for Sport England in the first four years of the strategy (as set out in Sporting Futures) was to set achievable targets with step change required in the subsequent four years of the strategy period, the organisation did not yet know what effect the tactics were having on the targets, and therefore to what extent the targets were achievable with the amount of available investment.
17. Ahead of the next quarterly report to Board (March 2019) the Executive Team would work with DCMS and other key partners to develop a clear, concise and well-conceived message about the breadth of what Sport England does. This message would, for example, encapsulate broader work with DCMS and other relevant Government departments and describe the economic savings and benefits of Sport England’s work and investments.

18. There was some consideration of more fundamental questions about the extent to which Sport England can influence different parts of the population. For example, with reference to the Active Lives Children & Young People (C&YP) results (agenda item 4), should Sport England have a stronger focus on C&YP and new types/pathways of investment into this audience that would result in children having a physical activity lifestyle by the time they leave secondary school.


SMac left the meeting. SJ joined the meeting.

Management Accounts and Staff Cost Projection 2019-20

20. SJ presented the reports, both of which had been discussed by the Audit, Risk & Governance Committee at its 21 November 2019 meeting. The Management Accounts provided a summary of key results of the accounts for 2018/19 at Month Seven (1 April to 31 October) based on the adoption of the new cost allocations.
SJ left the meeting.

Travel, Accommodation and Venue Booking Services Procurement

24. NP presented the item.

25. Approval was sought from the Board to commence a procurement exercise for the provision of travel, accommodation and venue booking services for three+ one years. Sport England currently spent approximately [redacted] per annum on travel, accommodation and venue hire. It was proposed that the new agreement was capped at a value of [redacted].

26. The Board APPROVED a maximum contract value of [redacted] for the provision of travel, accommodation and venue booking services for Sport England.

Update on Transgender Inclusive Guidance

27. PS advised the Board about Sport England’s plans to release transgender inclusive facilities guidance early in the new year. As a point of clarity, it was noted the guidance was in relation to the law on gender recognition as it now stands; separately Sport England had provided evidence to the Government’s review of the Gender Recognition Act.

28. The Board considered the potential reputational issues for the business. It was noted there were examples of existing good practice in sports clubs, in terms of the communication and implementation of this type of guidance, and Sport England should take the opportunity to talk to those in grassroots sport who were already doing good work in this area.

29. It was agreed a pre-release copy of the Guidance should be circulated to Board members for their information.

HP joined the meeting.

RESULTS OF ACTIVE LIVES CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SURVEY

30. LOK presented the report which provided an overview of the first set of Active Lives Children & Young People Survey results.

31. The survey provided a comprehensive view of the activity levels of children and young people in England. In headline terms, 43% of children (3 million) are currently active of which 18% (1.2 million) achieve the Chief Medical Officer guideline of 60 minutes or more every day. Conversely, 33% of children are doing less than 30 minutes (average) a day which equates to 2.3 million children and young people in England.
32. Regardless of where the activity target was set, fewer than 50% of children at every age group were meeting it. The findings aligned with other research in past years, however, the size of the Active Lives sample meant Sport England could drill down to Local Authority level and look at individual sports and activities, providing more context and ability to understand the issues.

33. The Board discussed some of the messages about age and gender inequalities, which at the age of 5 showed a marked difference of four percentage points. Those gaps continued through childhood, however, to a certain extent schools were managing to counter some of this. A significant difference in activity levels by family affluence was also apparent, with the swimming statistics in particular highlighting the difference between affluent (82%) and less affluent (42%) children being able to swim 25 meters unaided by the first year of secondary school. The difference in activity levels between types of schools (state maintained, academy and independent) was interesting and something to be explored further, particularly given the clear and positive link between activity levels and academic performance.

34. The Board would be presented with a further report in March 2019 which looked at the associations between attitudes - understanding more about what’s going on in children’s minds and how it is impacting their decisions and behaviours about activity. Sport England would be working with organisations in this space to build understanding of the links between behaviour and action.

35. The Board considered the results in relation to disability and activity levels across different age groups. HP explained the difference in these statistics could in part be due to the methodology – speaking to parents for years 1&2, directly to the children for year 7 and above, and for years 3-6 asking a different question in an attempt to align to impairments in simper language (i.e. do you need help with reading, writing etc). Special schools were excluded, however around 90% of children who are disabled are in regular schools.

36. The Board discussed the importance of building a better understanding about the challenges and barriers to physical activity outside of schools. If children and young people are not active what are they doing instead, for instance, to what extent is digital life an influence; what are the social environment issues i.e. who is influencing their behaviour, parents, peers etc.? The Families Fund was investing in test and learn projects that were delving into these types of questions, including issues of time, money, confidence and opportunity.

37. The survey results raised significant questions for Sport England and the wider sector. What the results showed was that for the majority of children and young people, the work Sport England and others (Local Authorities, Public Health etc.) were currently doing was not achieving the desired results. Whilst Sport England had a significant role to play, a whole system approach was needed to tackle the issues. No single part of the sector could achieve the desired change, a unified approach across Government, schools, parents etc. was needed and the Active Lives results provided an opportunity to develop messaging that would help penetrate beyond the sport and physical activity sector.

38. Sport England would use upcoming forums (ministerial roundtables etc.) as opportunities for a ‘call to action’. The Board challenged the Executive Team to think about how best to exploit
these types of engagement opportunities, and furthermore to use the results of the research to start informing a clear narrative about what needs to be done, by Sport England and others, to tackle the issues.

39. The Board **DISCUSSED** the key findings of the survey and their implications.

   *HP left the meeting. AR joined the meeting.*

**LOCAL DELIVERY PILOTS (LDP)**

40. CP introduced the item, reflecting on the developing relationship across all the pilots and the rich learning about changes and impact seen, which sits at the heart of the LDP programme; and Sport England being an integral part of the learning, delivery and strategic decision-making processes of the programme.

41. Two pilots were presented to the Board for approval of award of funding – an award to Birmingham City Council for delivery of the Birmingham and Solihull LDP which represented one of the larger pilot areas in terms of geography/population coverage and included significant numbers of Sport England target audiences; and an award to Essex County Council for the delivery of the Essex LDP, which was focussed at three levels - intensively in the most deprived areas of Tendring, Basildon and Colchester, a ‘universal offer’ across the same three authorities, and a number of interventions county-wide.

42. The Essex pilot embodied a range of proposals which were thoroughly routed in ‘people and place’ and demonstrated a deep understanding of the target audiences. A view was expressed that whilst the offer focused on those who are the least active and those who struggle the most due to poverty, disability or loneliness, the proposals relating to disability did not appear to include wider factors which added to the complexity of the issue, for example, care providers where numbers of carers were reducing significantly.

43. The Birmingham pilot’s theory of change was about empowering communities to take ownership and lead their own futures through creating ‘Active Communities’. It was built on a vision of distributed leadership from central public-sector voices to community leaders, where focus shifts to supporting and building up and out from local community need. There was some reflection on the level of challenge for Birmingham around culture (in terms of the area’s ethnic/religious issues) and the challenge to creating genuine interaction given these barriers.

44. The Chair of the Sport England Investment Committee reflected on the Committee’s discussion of the investment process for the programme (28 November Committee meeting). The customer journey process for LDP applicants recognised the need to create a flexible and adaptable system where Sport England could make several allocations to a pilot over time, or one larger combined pathfinder and accelerator amount in one go. The Committee had highlighted the importance of early test and learn, recognising success to scale quickly, and how to both embed and amplify the culture of learning across the LDP programme.
45. The Board discussed the value of focusing on learning, with information about what works and what doesn’t, shared not only across the LDP programme, but more broadly outside of the pilots. This ‘community of learning’ approach must be inherent in the process and it was important for the Board to have confidence that these types of conversations and regular sharing of information was taking place. Whilst formal reporting mechanisms at specific points in time (i.e. 6 and 12 months) were important, routine access to/regular sharing of information across the LDP project teams was equally valuable.

46. The Board considered ownership of the Intellectual Property in relation to learning from the LDP programme and whether the organisation should have provisions in place, or if the intention was for the IP to be in the public domain.

47. CP reflected on the growing community of learning and assured the Board there were mechanisms in place to help ensure sharing of knowledge and encourage open and frank debate. There was recognition that Sport England could improve how it communicated information about the programme i.e. more comprehensive telling of the ‘story so far’ that provided evidence-based examples of significant change.

48. NH expressed a view that areas of Government were still relatively unclear about what was meant by ‘theories of change’ and what Sport England was ‘buying for its money’ through the LDP investment. The concept of Place Based Working/Active Environments was understood, but Sport England needed to better articulate the LDP model as a product to help achieve support from Government and address any potential criticism that could be levelled at the organisation about the value of this investment. Furthermore, an improved communications package would enable stakeholders to be able to speak confidently about the programme.

49. The Board agreed the importance of addressing stakeholder communication and developing messaging which clearly articulated what Sport England was trying to achieve through this investment. The breadth of the programme meant that it was not possible to refer to the whole range of what was being done, rather Sport England needed to develop a succinct communication to explain to stakeholders and audiences outside of the organisation who were not embedded in nor visiting the pilots the key messages/totality of the programme and what it is trying to achieve and how.

50. The Board discussed the broader challenges of achieving the desired societal change through sport and physical activity over the last few decades, and the need for significant change to the interventions across Government and the health, sport and education sectors to effect change at population level. Communication about the programme should reflect this issue, and make it clear the programme was testing a wide range of interventions (some of which would be successful and potentially ‘game-changing’ and some of which would not) to learn how to influence the issues.

51. The Board discussed the importance of Sport England testing elements of the programmes that were replicable, i.e. not those elements that were restrictive/not replicable whether because of the level of investment required or for other reasons. CP assured the Board this was the case and said that how the system is working around people and place, and the
behaviour of people in the system who want to work together, was one of the strongest learnings emerging.

52. The Board would continue to receive regular updates on the programme, and members were welcome to share any information about the pilot place to which they were paired during these sessions.

**Investment into Birmingham & Solihull Pilot**

53. The Board **APPROVED** an award extension of up to £9.72 million to Birmingham City Council for delivery of the Birmingham and Solihull LDP, of which £7.358 million is confirmed and £2.362 is in-principle subject to the conditions in the Lottery Funding Agreement (as set out in paragraph 12 of the paper).

54. The Board **DELEGATED** the approval of all additional special conditions of award (as set out in paragraph 12.3 of the paper) to the Executive Director.

**Investment into Essex Pilot**

55. The Board **APPROVED** an award extension of up to £9.84 million to Essex County Council for delivery of the Essex LDP, of which £5.9025 million is confirmed and £3.9375 million is in-principle award subject to the conditions in the Lottery Funding Agreement (as set out in paragraph 12 of the paper).

56. The Board **DELEGATED** the approval of all additional special conditions of award (as set out in paragraph 12.3 of the paper) to the Executive Director.

*AR left the meeting. ES, GC, SB and HMacC joined the meeting.*

**NATIONAL GOVERNING BODIES**

**Update on NGB Recognition Policy Review**

57. Sport England was undertaking a review of the Recognition Policy (the Policy) to determine its purpose, value and how it is used by third party organisations with a view to deciding whether the Policy should be amended, replaced or withdrawn.

58. Three options were presented for the Board to consider - Option 1: Retain the concept of recognition and amend the Policy; Option 2: Withdraw the Policy, abandon the concept of recognition and introduce a new policy; and Option 3: Withdraw the Policy and do not replace it.

59. The Board discussed the purpose and value of Recognition, both for Sport England and for recognised bodies.

60. The Board expressed a preference for Option 1 but **AGREED** it would be sensible to explore both Options 1 & 2 further. The Board **AGREED** Option 3 should not be considered.
61. PS was directed to complete the review of the policy and make final recommendations to the Board in March 2019.

*ES and NH left the meeting.*

**End of Year 1 Review and Investment Decisions**

62. PS opened the item by reminding the Board what had been set out in the NGB Investment Guide published in 2016, this being the basis by which Sport England made awards and set NGB targets. At the end of the 2018-19 financial year Sport England would be half way through the 2017-21 funding cycle, at which point there would be clear evidence about whether targets had been and/or would be met and how the portfolio was evidencing its contribution to the Government’s outcomes. This would in turn inform recommendations for the final two years of the cycle to maximise the impact of the NGB investment portfolio, and help with preparations for the approach to NGBs from 2021 onwards.

63. GC provided an update on the overall performance of the portfolio, including the combined influence of the portfolio and the spread of NGBs who had overachieved, achieved, had a near miss or missed their targets.

64. The Board queried British Cycling’s (BC) positive performance rating given the overall decline in participation rates in cycling. The distinction here was that Sport England’s investment in BC was directed at specific audiences and sections of the cycling market (38% in total), where BC was performing well.

65. The Board discussed the LTA’s diversity activity rating. Tennis were targeting LSEG through the Serves programme, which was being integrated into the LTA’s programme of events. The LTA and Tennis Foundation were undertaking an external evaluation by Y Sport into the Serves programme to understand why it was not meeting its targets. The Board reflected on a more general point about which organisations were best placed to deliver Sport England’s engagement priorities on the ground.

66. The Board discussed the financial sustainability position of the NGBs, noting that work was ongoing with the NGBs to explore all potential sources of revenue. Whilst NGBs were on-track with reductions in back-office costs, significant challenges remained in finding efficiencies or attracting new income.

67. The Board recognised the significant progress that had been made, including in governance, leadership and changes to funding whilst maintaining good relationships across the NGB family.

68. The Board moved on to discuss the individual investment awards to eight NGBs for the April 2019 to March 2021 period.
British Cycling

69. The Board **APPROVED** a Mass Market award of up to £5,690,000 to British Cycling.

England Netball

70. The Board **APPROVED** an award of up to £2,800,000 to England Netball, consisting of an investment of up to £1,300,000 into their high-performance programme and up to £1,500,000 to support women to maintain and increase their physical activity levels through the continuation and growth of Back to Netball and Walking Netball.

England & Wales Cricket Board

71. The South Asian Communities programme had performed well, and it was important to ensure its existence was communicated to as wide an audience within the communities as possible. The Board suggested that Sport England Officers consider making communication/outreach a requirement of funding going forward.

72. The Board **APPROVED** an award of up to £1,000,000 to the England and Wales Cricket Board for the South Asian Communities offer.

Swim England

73. The Board discussed the ongoing decline in participation rates in swimming (as evidenced by the recent Active Lives Adult survey results).

74. Swim England was responsible for only a small part of the market, Leisure Operators for example had a significant role to play. The results from the Swim Local Pilots (which this investment funded) had informed the design of an evidence-based programme that sought to contribute to Sport England’s Decreasing Inactivity priority at scale. The proposed funding would enable Swim England to roll this programme out across a small number of operators and establish the business case for adoption across all operators.

75. The Board asked whether Sport England was able to measure the cost of reaching and then influencing certain audiences. The end of year 2 review would include details of a ‘cost per influence’ number.

76. The Board **APPROVED** an award of up to £460,000 to Swim England to support the established health and wellbeing team to continue to develop and deliver the Water Wellbeing model.

Exercise Movement & Dance UK

77. The Board **APPROVED** an award of up to £1,700,000 to Exercise Movement & Dance UK.
Baseball Softball UK (BSUK)

78. The Board noted that BSUK could not demonstrate strong alignment to Sport England’s overall strategic priorities, however, the focus of investment was on reduced subsidy which aligned with Sport England’s Demand Led Priority and the Government’s KPI 21 A & B (levels of public funding in sporting bodies and levels of non-public investment into sporting bodies respectively).

79. The Board **APPROVED** an award of up to £1,000,000 to Baseball Softball UK to primarily build and maintain functions which provide a strong core for the organisation and sport and facilitate BSUK’s transition towards a more sustainable business model.

Volleyball England

80. As with BSUK, Volleyball England could not demonstrate strong alignment to Sport England’s priorities, however, the focus of investment was on reduced subsidy which aligned with Sport England’s Demand Led Priority and the Government’s KPI 21 A & B (levels of public funding in sporting bodies and levels of non-public investment into sporting bodies respectively).

81. The Board **APPROVED** an award of up to £1,050,000 to Volleyball England.

British Fencing

82. The Board **APPROVED** an award of up to £424,000 to British Fencing to continue to support talented athletes to achieve Sport England’s progression objectives.

   *GC, SB and HMacC left the meeting. DT joined the meeting.*

COMMONWEALTH GAMES ENGLAND

83. PS presented the report, which invited the Board to consider Sport England’s investment approach to Commonwealth Games England (CWG) in the next cycle, culminating with a home games in Birmingham 2022.

84. The Board noted the cost of the next three cycles of the Games was circa. £28 million, which meant a reasonable challenge for CWG and Sport England in relation to CWG’s medium/longer term financial sustainability. Investment in this cycle would help manage some of the risk as well as capitalise on opportunities.

85. As a point of clarification, PS said Sport England had budgeted £4 million for this cycle, of which the Board was being asked to approve £2 million. The Sport England talent team would scope the remaining £2 million to support a combination of both medal preparation programmes for 2022 and legacy/ambition programmes to be delivered alongside the 2022 Games. The Board welcomed this, highlighting the importance of ensuring the investment connected to other legacy investment activities and programmes across the sector.
86. The Board discussed the risk of Team England under-performance due to availability (or otherwise) of high profile England athletes in key sports. As it was a home Games, it was imperative Team England sent its A-team. Members asked to what extent Sport England would be comfortable investing in CWG if this proved not to be the case, and what Sport England expected CWG to deliver for the investment i.e. number of medals, placement on the medal table. PS assured the Board Team England would be targeting the top of the medal table. The Board asked Sport England Officers to consider attaching a KPI to the funding on that basis.

87. The Board **APPROVED** a four-year Lottery award of £2 million to Commonwealth Games England, concluding March 2023, to support the performance of Team England and capitalise on the opportunities arising from hosting the 2022 Games.

88. The Board **NOTED** the Sport England talent team would scope the remaining £2 million to support:

   o Individual National Governing Bodies (NGBs) to deliver medal preparation programmes for athletes and programmes not in receipt of UK Sport World Class Performance (WCP) programme funding in the 2022 cycle.

   o Work with CGE and other partners to secure a legacy for the England Talent programme arising from hosting the 2022 Commonwealth Games, including proposals to deliver a ‘2022 Ambitions’ programme designed to inspire and educate talented athletes in England by providing a hosted major games experience.

89. The Board **REQUESTED** Sport England Officers consider attaching a KPI relating to targeting the top of the medal table to the funding.

**SPORT ENGLAND TALENT ADVISORY INCLUSION GROUP**

90. PS presented the report, inviting the Board to discuss the proposed approach, the specifics of which entailed the formulation of a ‘Talent Inclusion advisory group’. The advisory group would provide additional stimulus, oversight and influence in support of the execution of the organisation’s aspirations with regards to Talent Inclusion.

91. CG was supporting the work and described the ambition of the programme and the need to look radically at the specific stages within the England Talent pathway where we believe there are barriers which need to be addressed, for example, entry points to the talent system (schools, clubs, communities etc.), bringing together the positive deviants in each area.

92. It was recognised that in some instances the way to broaden gateways into sport would be through a multi-sports approach, with the intention being this programme of work would benefit all sports, including mainstream sports. Furthermore, it was important to be clear that greater diversity and inclusion within the talent system referred to all types of diversity including all protected characteristics and socio-economic status.
93. This was an important initiative and the Board requested an update report by May 2019 to include timescales for delivering actions identified and a clear set of ambitions. It was noted Sport England was engaging with NGBs which had good talent inclusion programmes about best practice.

94. The Board **APPROVED** the proposed approach which would result in an advisory group of ‘thought leaders’, chaired by a member of the Sport England Board, being convened.

*DT & RB left the meeting.*

**GOVERNANCE MATTERS**

*Annual Board Effectiveness Review*

95. The Chairman thanked Board members and the Executive Team for contributing to the Board Evaluation exercise and summarised the key findings of the exercise and the recommendations and actions based on the results.

96. The Board **APPROVED** the recommendations and proposed actions to address these as set out in Appendix 1 of the paper.

*Committee Terms of Reference*

97. The Board **APPROVED** the proposed changes to the Investment; Workforce; Audit, Risk & Governance; and Chairs & Remuneration Committees’ Terms of Reference.

*Annual Report of Investment Committee to the Board*

98. The Board **NOTED** the annual report of the Investment Committee.

*Annual Report of Workforce Committee to the Board*

99. The Board **NOTED** the annual report of the Workforce Committee.

**AOB**

100. The Chairman thanked WK thanked for his service to Sport England over the past three years and wished him every success for the future.

101. The Chairman appraised the Board of plans for the 5 February 2019 stakeholder engagement session.

102. There were no further areas of business.

The meeting closed at 2:30pm.

**PRIVATE SESSION**

103. A private session for the Board members and CEO was held.