



***BOARD OF TRUSTEES***  
***Wednesday 5 October 2016***

***RECORD OF MEETING***

***Present:***

Kevin Aitchison, Chair KMA  
Richard Allcroft RA  
Mary Daunt MD  
Andrew Flatt AF  
Simon Le 'Fevre SLF  
Margaret Moore MM  
Mike Spence MS  
David Pond CEO

**In attendance:** Elaine Sullivan, Hugh Crisp, Manchester Square Partners.

***1.0 Introduction***

1.0 KMA welcomed Elaine Sullivan and Hugh Crisp from Manchester Square Partners. He explained that they have been commissioned pro-bono to undertake an evaluation of Board performance. Part of the process is to witness the Board in session.

***2.0 Declaration of Interests***

2.1 SLF declared that his consultancy support to Sport England was continuing but confirmed that this specifically excludes him from any involvement with GBWR business.

2.2 No other interests declared.

***3.0 Apologies***

3.1 Nil. All Board members present.

***4.0 Minutes of Meeting dated 6 Jul 2016***

4.1 Approved.

***5.0 Actions Arising***

**5.1 Carried over from 19 February Board:**

2. *The Chair, Vice Chair and CEO to review Chair/CEO TOR and draft Vice Chair.*

*MS volunteered to lead on this action.*

**Action: MS**



## 5.2 Carried over from 9 March Board:

Recruitment Policy: The Board asked that the redrafted policy be presented for Board approval at the next meeting.

CEO explained that further work had been undertaken on this policy and thanked MM for her input. He said he still felt that further work was required to strip out detail that would be more appropriately placed in the guidance notes for interviewing panels. MD offered to work with MM to further review the policy.

**Action: MD/MM**

7.2 MD asked whether Mazar's had been critiqued. AF explained that he had worked very closely with them and had made them aware of the areas where he felt that they had under performed. MD further asked whether he felt that Mazar's wished to retain the GBWR work. AF responded that he had not specifically asked that question but reminded the Board that a key reason for Mazars taking on the work was that they were the RFU auditors and at the time the RFU was providing financial management services to GBWR albeit this is no longer the case. Following further discussion it was agreed that AF would present 3 auditor options to the GFC in December.

**Action: AF**

11.2 CEO reported that he had made little progress in gaining access to media output provided to the Sports Councils. Early discussions indicated that the councils themselves did not have any sophisticated means of capturing all media output. SLF proposed approaching the County Sports Partnerships requesting that they inform GBWR of any media coverage in their area relating to any form of wheelchair rugby. This would enable GBWR to address any issues of reputational concern and, as necessary, to correct where reported events are not the responsibility of GBWR. This approach was welcomed by CEO. KMA agreed and said that the key was that GBWR should gain as much awareness as possible of any activity that is happening under the guise of wheelchair rugby.

## 6.0 Charitable Donations 1 July -30 September 2016

Roma Sports (Sponsorship agreement)	£6000
Payroll Giving	£9
BT (Sponsorship agreement)	£60,000
Wales Rugby Charitable Trust	£15,000 (Restricted RDO Wales)

## 7.0 CEO Quarterly Report

7.1 The report was taken as read. MD asked:

- **How the athletes felt post Rio.** CEO explained that they were very disappointed immediately after the Canada result as they understood that it was a game they should have won. He said he was proud of Ayaz Bhutta and Jim Roberts who were interviewed by C4 immediately after the game and despite both being very upset, their dignified, thoughtful and measured interview showed great professionalism. He went on to say that the team as a whole showed great fortitude in bouncing back quickly to play both Brazil and Sweden defeating each in very clinical performances. The athletes are now more reflective of their performance and why they lost games but as with any professional athlete their focus is very much on looking ahead and to learn from their Rio experience.



- **MD offered help with the final Tokyo submission.** CEO thanked her but explained the UKS post Rio review process and the fact that this was not a new submission but a final submission of what had already been reviewed and assessed by UKS and which now addresses the additional detail requested by UKS.
- **MD asked who did unexpectedly well in Rio.** CEO said he did not feel particularly well qualified to answer that question. It had clearly been a very successful games for both the Olympians and Paralympians.
- **MD asked what the Plan B was should UKS not fund GBWR.** CEO said that the management team had discussed different scenarios. If there was no investment at all – which CEO felt to be an unlikely position –GBWR would still seek to have a national team but it would be on a very different basis. CEO would seek other funding sources but it would be unlikely that a source or sources would be found to fund the programme in the way it currently is. That would mean going back to a more volunteer based performance organisation which would rely on volunteers to support the team. The real difficulty would come from having no funding to either employ performance staff or to participate overseas against the best in the world. Without this it is difficult to see how the team could be realistic podium contenders in the future. The second scenario is one where UKS investment is less than required to resource the Tokyo plan. In this situation it will be a case of seeking additional external funding to fill the gap and then to review and prioritise the plan with performance as the key driver. There followed a wide ranging discussion with SLF providing helpful insight into the UKS funding process.
- **MD asked about the potential for the Wooden Spoon to help fund the GB squad.** CEO explained GBWR’s past and current work with Wooden Spoon and its broader funding interests which did not really align with funding the elite squad.
- **Noting the Clubmark licence, MS asked if we had a similar licence with Insport.** SLF explained that Insport was the Welsh equivalent quality system. CEO said that we do not have a licence but was aware that this is being used in Wales and would follow up and brief the board on the position with Insport in relation to GBWR clubs in Wales. **Action: CEO**
- **MS said he would be happy to support the Rainbow Laces campaign.** Other Trustees also said they would be interested to provide support.
- **MS asked for further details about the classification of athletes for the Variant game.** CEO explained that the challenge at the moment was how to deal with athletes that have mental health issues rather than physical impairments. CEO briefed on the work being undertaken to better understand this and said that it was likely that GBWR would have an ‘open class’ classification category though more work needs to be undertaken on this. In principle he said that GBWR is committed to meeting the aspirations of those with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and other mental health issues but that it is important to ensure that GBWR can guarantee a safe environment for all who take part in the sport and that GBWR also has the expertise and skills necessary to support all participants. SLF commented that it may be worth meeting with Cerebral Palsy (CP) Sports who also deal with mental health issues. RA also briefed that the IWRF is awaiting the report of a study it has commissioned into the classification of those with CP. This is focused on classification for the IPC recognised version of the game but it may still help inform the variant debate.

## 8.0 Finance & Governance

- 8.1 **August Budget Position.** AF briefed that he had reviewed the management accounts which show a positive variance of £19k for August. He explained that September/October will provide a better view of the mid year position as there was still some Rio costs to go through



the accounts. Overall he said the position looked good. CEO said that he had just completed his own monthly review and said he had no concerns. The management team will review the position based on the September accounts with a view to forecasting as accurately as possible the end of year position which, with Rio out the way, should be easier to predict. AF commented that he had flagged the number of aged debtors with CEO. MD had similarly noted the amount of aged debtors. CEO replied that he was addressing this and that the majority had already been paid and that there were plans in place to address all that was outstanding.

8.2 **Club Affiliations.** SLF reported that the GFC had considered the first batch of applications for Club Affiliation. The GFC was content that earlier weaknesses had been addressed and that the applications were strong and, subject to some minor amendments, the GFC recommended that the Board approve them. MM commented that the applications were good but that it was important to remain aware of how much we demand of the clubs bearing in mind their resource levels. CEO agreed and said that it was important to remember that many of our clubs have very small infrastructures, in some cases perhaps just one or two volunteers trying to do everything. The local RDO is key to supporting these clubs but they too have big portfolios and are not full time employees. The Board approved the following clubs for affiliation to GBWR subject to the action points identified by the GFC being addressed:

- Marauder Tigers Wheelchair Rugby Club
- Gloucester Wheelchair Rugby Club
- West Coast Crash Wheelchair Rugby Club
- Rygbi Gogledd Cymru
- Team Solent Sharks
- Ospreys Wheelchair Rugby Team
- London Wheelchair Rugby Club
- Stoke Mandeville Wheelchair Rugby

8.3 **Off-Line Assurance.** SLF provided the Board with the background to the off-line assurance process. He explained that it is important that all governance work is properly considered as part of the Board's assessment of each section in the assurance check-list. To that end the On Site audit report and recommendations will need to be considered when agreeing the level of assurance and this might well mean that Full assurance is not achieved for each of the sections. In particular the areas of Risk Management, Long Term Financial Planning and Succession Planning do require more work, though this is captured in the governance action plan. The Board looked through the draft submission before agreeing that:

- SLF will review CEO's draft submission
- CEO will make any changes as a result of SLF review
- CEO will circulate to Board members out of committee the proposed submission with proposed assurance ratings for each section for comment/agreement
- CEO will discuss Board feedback with KMA and as required either goes back to individual Board members or finalise and submit.

**Action: CEO/SLF/Chair**

8.4 **Governance Action Plan.** CEO presented the Governance Action Plan and reminded the Board that this was an operational document which he uses to monitor the progress of governance actions. He explained that this also was looked at by the GFC and he also sends it periodically to Sport England and UK Sport for information purposes. RA asked whether there was any negative impact in providing Sport England and UK Sport with a copy. CEO replied that if there was an impact it would be a positive one as they appreciated GBWR's



transparency and openness about its position and were positive about the progress made over the cycle.

- 8.5 **Super Series Evaluation 2015/16.** The Board noted the paper. KMA asked about the over-run of the cost of officials which had a significant impact on the budget. CEO agreed but reminded the Board that the competition had now grown to 3 leagues and so 9 weekends. This meant an increased cost to meet the number of officials required. It had also been necessary to bring in some overseas officials for Division 1. Although the budget had been exceeded he said he was happy to meet the additional cost as this was one of key resource areas that went down to grass roots. He also reminded the Board that from last year there had been a charge levied on teams entering the competition. This cost will be reviewed as part of the overall budget setting for future Super Series.

## 9.0 Strategic Plan 2017-2021

- 9.1 CEO introduced the draft plan '*More than a Game*'. He said that the core principles underpinning it were:

- being true to GBWR's charitable objects.
- evolution not revolution – the last 4 years have been very successful and the aim is to build on that and what has been learned.
- being conscious of external factors – not least the new DCMS and Sport England strategy and considering the fit with GBWR's aspirations.
- at this point not being too conscious of resource but setting out what we would like to do i.e. in terms of strategy our starting point should be "what do we want to achieve" rather than "what do our current resources allow us to achieve"..

- 9.2 The previous Board strategy session, which had included a SWOT analysis of where the organisation was, identified key strategic considerations for the future. These had been taken into account when formulating the strategy. The DMG had also been consulted with the main areas of difference from the current strategy discussed; these included for example the variant game and what place that should have in our delivery going forward.

- 9.3 AF commented that he thought it was a good document but that he would like to see the Strategic Objectives laid out at the front. RA said he liked the strategy and asked that the International Management Group be included in the 'how are we governed' section. MD and MM commented that they thought it a good document. SLF said that it might be good to have the BOT election process covered in the document and also wondered if volunteers should be more explicit in the vision as they were highlighted in the introduction. Following discussion it was agreed that this was captured in Strategic Priority 6. He proposed a change to Strategic Priority 4 to read '*Achieve and maintain podium success...*' this was agreed. He further proposed a change to the first bullet at Strategic Priority 9 to read '*and contribute to para-sport.....*'. This was agreed. KMA commented that the paper was good but wondered if 9 strategic priorities were too many though he was content to support the paper as it was. With the amendments agreed above the board agreed the 2017-2021 Strategy subject to review post Sport England and UK Sport investment decisions. The Board also considered the format for the four-year rolling forecast, which would show high level figures on the principal sources of income/funding, and expenditure totals across the key programmes, for the whole of GBWR business.

***Post Board Note: It would make sense to review and finalise at the Board Development Day in Jan 17***

***Action: amend draft to reflect comments***

***CEO***



#### **10.0 GBWR Risk Appetite**

10.1 SLF presented this item. He said that the purpose of the item was to ensure that the Board considers its risk appetite, allowing time for reflection so that the December Board meeting might consider agreeing the strategic risks. These could then be reviewed at the Board development day in January by which time GBWR should also know its future funding position. He said that the aim of agreeing a risk appetite was to set the high level risk framework within which the CEO and his team can then operate. Following discussion SLF introduced the Sport England and UK Sport risk appetite statements. These were analysed and discussed as a basis for helping to shape the Board's thinking on what may be appropriate for GBWR. KMA drew the discussion together and asked that:

- Board members reflect on the matter and forward any points to SLF by 18 November.
- SLF provide a draft risk appetite statement for the Board to consider at its December meeting.

**Action: All**

#### **11.0 Matters Reserved for the Board**

11.1 CEO presented a draft paper and thanked SLF who had helped shape it. He said that he had drawn on Charity Commission and advice for small charities provided by the Institute of Chartered Secretaries Association. Following discussion AF commented that this should be looked at in the context of the board delegations that were already in place. MD also questioned how this mapped into other documents. Following further discussion it was agreed that:

- existing delegation documents be circulated to the board
- AF and MD would take these and any comments from board members and provide any amendments

Subject to the above the Board approved the document.

**Action: AF/MD forward amendments to CEO**

#### **12.0 AOB**

12.1 **International Update.** RA introduced his paper on international appointments. He explained that the IWRF had called for interest in Technical Delegate positions for the next 4 years. GBWR was proposing 3 nominations – John Timms, Dawn Watson and Richard Allcroft. RA provided a short overview of the experience of all three candidates. KMA asked RA why he was not standing for the Tokyo TD position. RA replied that having held this position for London and Rio he thought it important to give someone else the opportunity and it was hoped that John Timms might be successful. He said that this is a very influential position and so there was an advantage to GB holding it. Following discussion the board agreed to support all three nominations.

12.2 KMA asked RA to provide an update on the IWRF Board elections. RA explained that nominations had now closed for the vacant positions and that there were 5 candidates for 2 Member at Large positions. RA and MS were both standing for these. RA explained the voting process and it was agreed that the risk of a split in the potential “GB vote” was probably low and manageable.

12.3 **MD** advised that she will be attending the Officials training day in Birmingham and the Division 2 Super Series event in Walsall.

12.4 **MM** reported that she had published an article in Travers Smith about her role with GBWR (**copy on website**) and that RA would be presenting to Travers Smith.

## Board Record

Great Britain Wheelchair Rugby



- 12.5 **MS** reported that he had attended the Gloucester invitation tournament which was well run and sponsored by EDF.
- 12.6 **SLF** reported that he and MD would attend the NCVO training day in November and would report back any interesting highlights.
- 12.6 **KMA** discussed arrangements for the Board development day and proposed a dinner the night before where Manchester Square Partners would discuss their report. This was agreed and CEO will address location and arrangements.  
**Action: CEO**
- 13.0 Summary of Actions:

Item:	Action:	Person Responsible
4.1	Review of ToR for the CEO, Chair and Vice Chair	MS
4.2	Recruitment policy to be further reviewed	MM/MD
7.2	Position of the auditor to be reviewed at the year end. 3 options to be presented to the GFC	AF
7.1	Confirm position of InSport accreditation	CEO
8.3	Finalise Off-Site Assurance and submit	CEO/SLF/KMA
9.3	Amend draft Strategic Plan to reflect Board comment	CEO
10.1	Board members to reflect on appropriate risk appetite for GBWR Ltd	ALL
11.1	Forward Matters Reserved For Board amendments to CEO	AF/MD
13.0	Action arrangements for Board Development Day	CEO

Date of Next Meetings:

5 Oct	Board Trustees	Knight Frank
6 Dec	GFC	Knight Frank
14 Dec	Board Trustees	Knight Frank
30 Jan	Board Dinner	TBA
31 Jan	Board Development Day	