

Minutes

Name of Company	British Paralympic Association
Meeting	Board Meeting
Location	Meeting held virtually, via Microsoft Teams.
Date	Wednesday 14 December 2022

Item	Topic	Action
1.0	Introduction, apologies for absence, declarations of interest	
	In the absence of the BPA Chair, NW, due to illness, the Vice-Chair, DC, assumed the Chair of the meeting, in line with BPA article 30.10. DC welcomed the Board and Executive colleagues to the meeting at 12:00. GE was welcomed to his first BPA Board meeting, following his election at the recent AGM.	
	Attendance and Apologies for Absence	
	<p>BOARD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> David Clarke, Chair (DC) (Until 15:45) Kate Adams (KA) (Until 16:00) Chris Brown (CB) (Chair from 15:45) Graham Edmunds (GE) Sally Hancock (SH) Fred Hargreaves (FH) Helene Raynsford (HRf) David Ross (DR) (Until 13:30) Helen Rowbotham (HRb) Anne Wafula-Strike (AWS) (Until 16:25) <p>STAFF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mike Sharrock (MS) Penny Briscoe (PeB) Anna Scott-Marshall (ASM) Jenny Seymour (JS) Adrian Stockman (AS) Rob Tate (RT) Jennie Cooper (JC) – For Item 4.0 <p>APOLOGIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pippa Britton (PiB) Nick Webborn (NW) Verity Naylor (VN) 	

	Declarations of Interest	
	There were no new declarations of interest	
1.1	Minutes of the Board meeting on 12 October 2022	
	There were no comments on the accuracy of the minutes of the 12 October meeting and the minutes were approved.	
1.2	Matters Arising not already covered in the agenda	
	There were no matters arising that aren't addressed in later agenda items.	
2.0	CEO & Senior Leadership Team Report	
	<p>MS introduced the report and invited questions from the board.</p> <p>KA asked about the process for determining participation in the Games Guest Programme, whether Board can be involved, and if there are opportunities to consider our social impact objectives during that process. MS responded that the Chair has previously been involved in confirming Guest Programme invitations, but that there could be opportunities for further Board involvement, and consideration of social impact. ASM and JS will be leading this work, beginning early in 2023.</p> <p>KA's second question related to the timeline for development of the BPA's Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan, and when this would be brought to board. AS outlined the current position of that work, confirmed the Inclusion and Diversity Project Group are developing actions against each of the BPA's Diversity and Inclusion Ambitions, discussed at October Board, and indicated the intention to present a draft Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan to Board in March 2023.</p> <p>Finally, KA expressed her thanks for the People update provided in the Executive Report, noting her appreciation of the insight provided, which supports Board's role as custodians.</p> <p>CB outlined two areas where he would welcome further assurance – Philanthropy and Social Impact. On the first, CB wished to understand how the BPA will move forward its plans to increase philanthropic income, in light of the changes outlined in the budget reforecast. MS responded that the reforecast represents a move to "de-risk" philanthropic income by reducing reliance on it in the current cycle but stressed that it was still the BPA's intention to pursue an increase in revenue from philanthropic sources. On the second point, it was noted that a Social Impact update would follow later in the agenda.</p> <p>DC asked whether the BPA was prioritising disability in its Diversity and Inclusion plans, given the special purpose of the BPA in that regard. AS responded to confirm that specific efforts are being taken to promote disability inclusion, noting that the organisation's ambition statement contains specific reference to Disability Confident where other factors of inclusion do not receive the same profile. AS also pointed to the Beyond the Podium programme, which has a specific focus on promoting and supporting disability inclusion to the BPA's commercial partners.</p> <p>AWS expressed the view that the BPA should be leading the way in this area, given its role and purpose as an organisation. She identified that</p>	<p>Draft Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan to be shared with Board in March 2023</p>

	<p>progress would require specific actions aligned to a clear vision for greater representation.</p> <p>HRf noted it would be beneficial to coordinate the work of the BPA's internal D&I project group and the Athlete Commission sub-advisory group on Diversity and Inclusion, which is being established.</p> <p>DC asked MS to describe his perception of how the BPA is positioned at this point in the cycle, compared to previous games cycles. MS responded that he had limited ability for comparison, given that his previous Games experiences were mired by the COVID Pandemic. However, he expressed the view that the BPA is in a good place, that a lot was learned from Tokyo and was now being implemented by the Team in the run-up to Paris to improve both performance and experience for all those involved, and that the BPA had turned a corner with Social Impact, had a great team in place and now had some momentum behind the objective. PeB furthered MS's view – expressing positivity about the BPA's current position, and the excellent work that is going into Paris preparations.</p> <p>GE, reflecting on the Public Affairs Plan, asked about the status of disability representation in Westminster, and whether the BPA has appropriate contacts to implement the plan. ASM responded, acknowledging recent political turbulence, whilst noting that things are settling down and reassuring the Board that the BPA continues to build positive relationships at Parliament – particularly through All Party Parliamentary Groups for Disability Sport. ASM explained the importance of continuing to build new relationships and pivoting existing relationships to move beyond support for ParalympicsGB and into opportunities to promote our social impact objectives.</p> <p>Finally, MS asked ASM to update on the Film Project, which is in development, in partnership with one of the BPA's major Donors. ASM began by acknowledging that the BPA is benefitting from a surfeit of opportunities related to Social Impact, and one challenge associated with this is the need to identify the most impactful opportunities to pursue, taking into account the BPA's capacity. She explained that a film project was currently in the early development stages, with conversation ongoing between the BPA, the Donor who is offering to invest in the film project, and a production company with significant experience in relation to disability sport. The purpose of this phase is to identify whether the project objectives are aligned with the BPA's strategy, determine how the project can deliver on the BPA's social impact objectives, and consider what additional actions will be necessary to make the project a success. It is hoped that the project can further the BPA's efforts to establish athletes as advocates for the BPA's social impact objective.</p>	
3.0	Paris Budget Reforecast	
	<p>AS summarised the key elements of the reforecast as being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - £1 million of income had been taken out of the budget, representing £1.5 m of philanthropy income, partially offset by adding £1/2 m of commercial income - £1 million of costs had been added - An uplift of £1.4 million from having final income and spend figures from the Tokyo and Beijing cycle - A predicted reserves level at March 2025 of £3 ¼ m, compared to a minimum requirement of £2.5 m <p>AS noted that, within the reforecast, the numbers have: a reduced level of income risk; a more realistic set of costings and inflation cover; and some</p>	

	<p>spending decisions which can be deferred to help manage residual risk. Importantly, the focus has been kept on both key planks of the BPA strategy.</p> <p>AS concluded by confirming there is still risk in the reforecast and there are looming pressures for the next planning cycle but at this stage, the position looks healthy.</p> <p>CB reminded Board that, at this point in the cycle, there is still time for improvements to be made, particularly given the work being done by JS to generate new revenue, and by AS to control costs. CB noted that this disciplined approach will benefit the organisation.</p> <p>MS reflected on the reforecasting process, and expressed his view that a disciplined, strategic mentality was being demonstrated by all involved.</p> <p>KA expressed her appreciation for the quality of the paper, before asking about the “contingency” costs identified, noting that Social Impact related expenditure was disproportionately represented. MS acknowledged this was the case, accepting that it was a reflection of the BPA’s priorities, but also highlighting that Social Impact is now firmly included in the plan, rather than being treated as a “non-core” item. MS reassured the Board that Social Impact is a key strategic priority and will continue to be prioritised.</p> <p>CB noted that there is a relationship between implementation of social impact strategy and the financial resources that will be available to support it – the issue of longer-term investment into social impact objectives should resolve itself if the roll out of the social impact strategy is successful in driving revenue generation. DC concurred and noted the importance of MS’s earlier point; that Social Impact is no longer considered “non-core” expenditure.</p> <p>DC expressed his feeling of assurance, and gratitude for the level of detail provided by the executive to address the rationale behind the numbers.</p> <p>The budget reforecast was approved.</p>	
4.0	Risk Appetite and Risk Management	
	<p>JC introduced the Risk Appetite and Risk Management Paper, explaining the outcomes that were being sought, and invited questions from the Board.</p> <p>CB asked how the Executive’s proposed risk appetite model was intended to function. RT responded that the idea of adding in Risk Appetite is to improve the quality and relevance of reporting to Board – reporting can be tailored to reflect the Board’s appetite and areas of concern, and the Executive can use risk appetite as a parameter to guide decision making.</p> <p>CB enquired further about how practical the new policy will be. RT responded that, since the model is new, it will be difficult to answer that question before the policy is tested, but that the policy has been designed as a practical framework for Board and Executive decision making, and a guide to prioritisation of risk management. CB agreed and said the best advice would be to go ahead, start using it and seeing what works and what doesn’t.</p> <p>FH noted the importance of balancing risks with opportunities and asked how opportunities can be considered in the risk process. RT agreed and explained how this balance had been considered to date, and how this was reflected in the risk appetite approach proposed.</p>	

	<p>HR expressed her view that the paper is really good and that the proposed model combines the best of other risk models. However, care is needed to ensure the organisation does not rely on the model to do more than it can reasonably be expected to deliver.</p> <p>KA noted that it is very hard to articulate risk appetite e.g., appetite for a given particular partner may vary according to the nature of that potential partner. Additionally, the Board may not all have the same view on that particular decision. So, the model can only delegate so far, some things will always need special consideration, and a buddying system of greater check and challenge may be necessary to manage risk effectively during the implementation of the new system. RT and MS agreed, and noted that there are additional safeguards in place, for example the Deals panel giving consideration to new commercial partnerships, and the risks associated with them.</p> <p>RT asked Board for their preference on how the policy is brought back for final approval. DC and CB concurred that good progress has been made, and that Board would appreciate further discussion at the next Board meeting, once the executive has had the opportunity to implement and test the new policy.</p> <p>JC then summarised the Risk Dashboard, highlighting changes that had been made since the last meeting in line with the proposed changes to the Risk Policy.</p> <p>GE asked about the structure of the dashboard, and particularly the use of colour coding to highlight different strategic areas and risk types, noting this could be confusing. JC agreed to revisit this in future dashboards, to reduce the potential for confusion.</p> <p>KA asked the Executive whether there is confidence that Paris Security is the organisation's highest risk. PeB responded that this score reflects the input of the BPA Head of Security, and that Exec are confident that the risk scoring is a true reflection of the BPA's current position. MS noted that a major challenge with this risk is that the BPA has limited control over mitigation, as this responsibility lies primarily with the French Authorities.</p> <p>FH asked whether there is a specific threat to the ParalympicsGB team, or if the risk score reflected the general threat facing all Games attendees. MS and PB clarified that there is no specific threat which the BPA is aware of but noted that there is concern that a specific threat to UK athletes could arise and, as a result, precautions were being taken, such as attending recce trips without PGB kit.</p> <p>CB suggested that the risk register should be double checked against the BPA strategy, to ensure that all areas of the strategy were being properly considered.</p>	<p>Risk Policy to be brought to March Board for further discussion and approval.</p> <p>Risk dashboard structure to be reviewed.</p> <p>Risk register to be compared against BPA strategy.</p>
5.0	<p>Governance</p> <p>In light of time, and DC's need to depart by 16:00, the Board agreed to re-order the agenda to address Governance items before DC's departure.</p>	
5.1	<p>Re-appointment of Chris Brown</p> <p>CB temporarily left the meeting. DC and RT explained the requirement for a Board decision on the re-appointment of CB following the completion of his first term. The Board briefly discussed and unanimously approved CB's reappointment for a second term.</p>	

	<p>CB re-joined the meeting and was updated on his re-appointment. DC congratulated CB on behalf of the Board and recognised the valuable contribution CB has made to the Board so far. CB expressed his gratitude to the Board for his re-appointment.</p>	
5.2	<p>Appointment of Board leads for Safety & Welfare and Inclusion & Diversity</p> <p>RT summarised the request for Board advice on the appointment of Board leads for specific topic areas and invited feedback from Board.</p> <p>AWS proposed that “Champions” would be a good title for the Board lead roles, and also explained the importance of including “Equity” as a consideration alongside Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. RT agreed that Equity will be considered during the development of the Inclusion and Diversity Action Plan and the role description for the Inclusion and Diversity Board Champion.</p> <p>CB enquired about opportunities to collaborate with the BOA Board in relation to these roles. RT agreed this could be considered as the roles are developed.</p> <p>HRb noted that it would be helpful to match the Board Champion roles to individuals with experience on the relevant topic. DC agreed and suggested that the skills matrix is used to identify potential candidates.</p> <p>HRf asked whether the roles could be shared, suggesting as an example that it might be helpful to share responsibility for different aspects of safety and welfare and noting that ultimately the Board has collective responsibility for the topics under discussion. DC agreed but noted that compliance with A Code for Sports Governance will require a named Board Lead. RT agreed to consider role-sharing as the role descriptions are further developed.</p> <p>AWS noted that, whilst some organisations might treat this as a box-ticking exercise, the BPA must make these topics top of its agenda and address them properly. MS reassured the Board that these are absolutely priorities for the organisation and referenced examples of the BPA’s good work in the areas of safety and welfare.</p> <p>Board was asked to indicate their interest in taking on one of the Board Champion roles to RT via email. RT confirmed that the roles will need to be confirmed and appointed at the March Board Meeting.</p>	<p>Board to indicate interest in taking on a Board Champion role to RT via Email.</p> <p>Board to agree finalised role description and appointments at March Meeting.</p>
5.1	<p>Social Impact Update</p>	
	<p>KA started by giving an overview of recent Social Impact Committee discussions. She noted that the over-arching project is in a positive position and has made great development in the short period that dedicated resource has been in place. KA went on to note the importance of decision making when the organisation is faced with a multitude of opportunities. To succeed, the BPA must be brave enough to pick a few things to be exceptional at and decline other opportunities – it is not possible to do everything well.</p> <p>ASM clarified that whilst reference was made frequently to the Social Impact “Team”, there is in fact only a single full-time resource, the Head of Social Impact, and it’s to the BPA’s great benefit that she is doing such fantastic work. ASM summarised the Board paper and invited questions from the Board.</p>	

	<p>GE expressed his excitement at the enthusiasm demonstrated and asked about opportunities to monetise our social impact work by supporting other organisations. ASM confirmed that the opportunity does exist, and that there are examples of this already through projects like Beyond the Podium. HRb agreed but noted that the most efficient approach to realising the value of our Social Impact expertise would likely be in larger partnerships rather than providing consultancy services.</p> <p>HRb asked about opportunities for alignment with the British Olympic Foundation, noting that they are already building their activity in this area. ASM noted that the BPA have been working closely with the BOF, and recently met with them to discuss the development of their Theory of Change. MS expanded on this to note that opportunities existed for further cooperation between the BOF and BPA.</p> <p>CB asked how the BPA plan to choose a partner for this work when there are multiple options on the table. He noted his willingness to support that process, drawing on his professional experience, if helpful. MS thanked CB for the offer, noted that those considerations were underway, and invited CB to join the upcoming discussions.</p> <p>FH asked how the BPA is engaging with national and international disability inclusion projects such as We the 15 and Valuable 500. ASM provided an update on recent conversations with the IPC and other relevant partners. The Board had a short discussion on the roll out of those projects, the role of the BPA in supporting them, and what the BPA could learn to benefit its own social impact strategy.</p>	
5.2	Environmental Sustainability Plan	
	<p>ASM introduced the Environmental Sustainability Plan and invited questions from the Board.</p> <p>HRf noted a pre-Tokyo conversation, in her role as Athlete Commission Chair, with an athlete-led organisation established by athletes that was seeking to provide athlete education on environmental sustainability, and secure support for its “Oly Earth” campaign. Though that conversation happened too late for action ahead of Tokyo, HRf indicated that the organisation was still interested to work with the BPA and to adjust their campaign accordingly to be inclusive of Paralympic Athletes. ASM updated that the organisation in question has been working with UK Sport, the BPA and the BOA, and that consideration was underway about a partnership ahead of Paris.</p> <p>KA noted that Board must consider the nature of the BPA’s ambition in relation to environmental sustainability, in the context of her earlier comments around “picking what to be great at”. It is likely that the BPA’s objective is to improve its own environmental sustainability, but not to be a leader on the topic. KA further noted the importance of having transparency and independence in the process of assessing the BPA’s Carbon Footprint – the BPA shouldn’t mark its own homework. DC concurred.</p> <p>MS noted that the BPA has not yet signed the UN Sports for Climate Action Framework, though several partners have, including the BOA, UK Sport and the IPC. MS assured the Board that it is the BPA’s intention to work towards doing so, but that the Executive feel it’s not yet the right time. ASM expanded that timing is important, and the BPA won’t make a commitment</p>	

	until it's clear on its current environmental footprint and what will be necessary to achieve that commitment.	
	DC left the meeting at 15:45, and the Board appointed CB to chair the remainder of the meeting.	
6.0	BPA Response to Cost-of-Living Crisis	
	<p>AS summarised the impact of the current Cost-of-Living crisis and the BPA's response and invited feedback from the Board. MS noted that this is a topic high on the agenda of UK Sport, and that the financial impact is a huge issue for NGBs.</p> <p>HRf noted that the cost of living has a particularly significant impact on disabled athletes who, for example, must travel further and incur higher costs to access inclusive facilities.</p> <p>HRb asked for clarity on the impact on BPA staff. AS noted that, whilst the Senior Leadership Team are not aware of significant hardship affecting BPA staff, the offer of Winter Heating support had been gladly welcomed.</p> <p>CB enquired whether the impact of the financial environment on NGBs would push UK Sport to reconsider its funding structures, and whether there is a role for the BPA to play here. MS summarised recent discussions with UK Sport and NGBs about the state of play and noted that a large number of NGBs indicated they are experiencing significant financial challenges. GE asked for clarity on the number of NGBs affected, and MS indicated that 95% of those attending a recent UK Sport meeting were feeling heavily impacted. PeB noted that UK Sport is already considering alternative structures for winter sports governance and investment, but that this had resulted in negative feedback from some impacted NGBs. HRb noted that the support needed by NGBs will run into hundreds of thousands of pounds, and therefore it wasn't an easy fix for the BPA to provide; although the BPA has a strong balance sheet, the demands of the short and medium term combined with the scale of the need within NGBs make direct transfer of funds unviable for the BPA. CB asked whether there are other opportunities for the BPA to support its members, and MS confirmed that the executive would consider how it could provide support.</p> <p>GE asked whether the BPA should add the potential for changes to the structure of the sector and the financial position of NGBs to the risk register. MS agreed that would be worthwhile.</p>	Changes in the sporting landscape to be added to the Risk Register
7.0	International Relations Strategy	
	<p>ASM summarised the International Relations Strategy, noting that there is an upcoming deadline to formally bid for UK Sport investment, and invited comment from the Board.</p> <p>GE noted that he had several questions about the strategy, but that these would be better handled outside the meeting.</p> <p>MS noted, in support of the strategy, that his experience at recent IPC meetings has indicated a desire from other NPCs to seek support and advice from the BPA. MS felt that this provided a fantastic opportunity for the BPA to build partnerships at the international level, and the Board agreed.</p>	
8.0	Any other business	

	<p>SH asked for an update on the BPA's position in relation to recent IPC and IOC statements relating to Russia and Belarus. ASM confirmed that the BPA's position remains unchanged since the recent IPC EGM. MS noted that the positions taken by the IPC and IOC are slightly different. At this point, it isn't felt there is further action for the BPA to take, but the organisation is prepared to respond if required.</p> <p>PeB led the Board in acknowledging the recent passing of Barry Schofield, the BPA's first general secretary, a long serving Honorary Vice President, and a hugely influential and supportive figure in the organisation. The Board commended Barry's significant contribution to the BPA and the Paralympic movement.</p> <p>CB ended the meeting by acknowledging that this would be MS's final meeting as CEO. CB led the Board in thanking MS for his exceptional contributions over the past four years.</p>	
	CB closed the meeting at 16:38	