

Minutes

Name of Company	British Paralympic Association
Meeting	Board Meeting
Location	BPA offices, New Cavendish St, London with some attendees joining via Teams
Date	Wednesday 20 July 2022

Item	Topic	Action
1.0	Introduction, apologies for absence, declarations of interest	
	The Chair welcomed the Board, Exec and BPA colleagues to the meeting at 12:55.	
	Attendance and Apologies for Absence	
	BOARD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nick Webborn (Chair) Anne Wafula-Strike (AWS) Kate Adams (KA) (Until 15:30) Helene Raynsford (HRf) Helen Rowbotham (HRb) Forbes Dunlop (FD) (Until 16:05) Pippa Britton (PiB) Fred Hargreaves (FH) Sally Hancock (SH) David Clarke (DC) (Until 14:06) STAFF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mike Sharrock (MS) Penny Briscoe (PeB) Jenny Seymour (JS) Anna Scott-Marshall (ASM) Adrian Stockman (AS) Rob Tate (RT) Jennie Cooper (JC) (Item 4) Clare Cunningham (CC) (Item 5) Apologies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chris Brown (CB) David Ross (DR) 	
	Declarations of Interest	
	There were no other declarations of interest	

1.1	Minutes of the Board meeting on 30 March 2022	
	SH noted that it was her who declared that her Husband was on the Board of British Swimming at the March meeting, not PiB as was indicated in the draft minutes. There were no other comments on the accuracy of the minutes of the 30 March meeting and the minutes were approved.	
1.2	Matters Arising not already covered in the agenda	
	<p>AS confirmed that all matters arising have been completed or are covered later in the agenda, except for a small number which members of the Exec Team were asked to provide updates on.</p> <p>ASM updated on efforts to explore the nature of the We the 15 campaign, explaining that we are awaiting a meeting with the IPC on the subject. NW noted that greater member engagement from the IPC would be appreciated on this topic and HRf added that Athlete engagement in relation to the project was limited. HRf also updated the Board on two recent research calls she was involved in, led by Loughborough University, which explored reasons the We the 15 campaign had not had great traction in the UK. It was understood that the IPC were involved in commissioning the research. HRf will provide a more detailed update on these calls to ASM and Jill Puttnam (Head of Social Impact).</p> <p>PeB provided an update on UK Sport's (UKS) Winter Investment Process. UKS Board will meet on 21 July to make investment decisions, with outcomes expected to be shared on 25 July. PeB also reported a conversation with John Wood (UKS Performance Advisor leading on Winter Sport) to discuss the process, where the argument was made for earlier engagement of the BPA in future investment processes.</p> <p>JS provided an update on the challenge received from the Campaign Group "Culture Unstained" in relation to our partnership with BP. JS noted that we have communicated to the group in response to their challenge, after consultation with BP, and have not received any further response.</p> <p>MS provided an update on UK Sport events which the BPA could attend. This included the Rugby League World Cup, which PiB noted would be the first to combine the Men's, Women's, and Wheelchair events. MS also noted an opportunity to attend the International Paratriathlon Conference in Swansea between 3-5 August, which takes place alongside the World Triathlon Para Series event on 6 August. BPA Exec will share more opportunities with Board as they arise, and Board Members can also share opportunities they identify. NW also noted that the opportunity for the BPA to attend Member's events was raised at the recent NPC meeting.</p>	
2.0	Exec Team report	
	<p>MS introduced the report and invited questions.</p> <p>KA asked about the potential resource and workload impact of the BPA's involvement in the UK bid to host World Para Swimming and World Para Athletics, and whether there should be an item on the risk register in relation to the Bid or the set-up of the new organisations. ASM explained that the project was primarily led and funded by UKS, with the BPA contributing as the NPC. Set-up costs will be the primary concern, and these costs will not become clear until later stages of the bidding process when bidders will be provided a better understanding of both organisation's finances, though ASM noted that UKS have made some financial provision for this. HRb noted that, once established, the BPA will have very limited involvement in the operation of each organisation, like our existing relationships with other independent International Federations. PiB asked</p>	

	<p>whether there was an opportunity to learn from BISFed, the international federation of Boccia, which was the most recent IF to be established in the UK. ASM explained that David Hadfield (President of BISFed) had been engaged in the project. FD said this would be a great opportunity for the development and prominence of disability sport in the UK and was pleased to see the BPA leading the bid process.</p> <p>NW took the opportunity to note his congratulations to David Hadfield on his receipt of an OBE for services to sport in the Queen's Birthday Honours List.</p> <p>In relation to the Social Impact Strategy, KA asked what the BPA have stopped doing to resource the social impact work. MS responded that there was nothing that the BPA has stopped doing but noted that we have increased resource by bringing in excellent new staff to lead the social impact work. MS also noted that the Exec team will keep an eye on possible impacts of the social impact strategy on the workload of other teams, for example the Commercial Managers. ASM noted that this topic is included on the Risk Register.</p> <p>FH asked for an update on the proposed new business event. JS explained the resource challenges that led to the planned event being postponed but noted the intention is still to host an event soon and that plans are being developed, with the potential to be involved in a City of London event on 9 September. KA requested that Board receive at least two months' notice of any events, so they have time to publicise the events to their contacts.</p> <p>NW asked for clarity on the Athlete Community project, and how this relates to previous discussion related to plans for a BPA Alumni group. ASM explained that BPA alumni is a core part of the Athlete community project, but that the change of name reflects the desire to engage all athletes (current and retired) within the BPA's advocacy and social impact plans. The broader group also establishes an opportunity for athlete peer mentoring and other links between current and retired athletes. ASM also noted that discussions are underway regarding sponsorship of the project. NW reflected on the importance of engaging alumni, particularly those who aren't engaged by the Athlete Commission (because of the Athlete Commission time limits) and noted that we should consider how best to utilise the newly completed athlete database. NW also noted a previous offer of financial support to the alumni project from the Disability Sport Development Trust and suggested getting in touch with Mike Brace to discuss, whilst also considering additional sponsorship opportunities. MS added that we are in discussions with Salesforce about potential funding for the project, so we need to be mindful of what aspects different funders might be supporting.</p> <p>HRF noted previous attempts to establish a Paralympians Club and asked about the role the Athlete Commission could play in supporting development of an Athlete Community that athletes will engage with. HRF noted her concern that the priorities shared for the project were focused on how the athletes could contribute to the BPA, and not vice versa. ASM responded that the priorities HRF references are for the Social Impact Strategy, not specifically the Athlete Community project; that it is important that the link between Athlete Community and the social impact strategy is correct, so athletes have a well-rounded experience; and that there is definitely an important role for the Athlete Commission to play, as the Athlete Community can't be delivered without engagement from Athletes.</p>	<p>JS to invite Board to New Business Event at earliest opportunity</p> <p>ASM to reach out to Mike Brace</p>
--	--	---

	<p>A discussion ensued on the purpose of the Athlete Community and striking a balance between the goals of connecting and engaging athletes and involving athletes in the BPA's advocacy and social impact campaigns. It was noted that the two goals are not mutually exclusive, but that a strong athlete community is a necessary foundation for encouraging athletes to get involved in the social impact work. It was further noted that success in both goals requires that athletes feel valued and engaged, and that there must be benefit to the athletes for their engagement in the community, not just to the BPA. Finally, it was noted that the BPA should look to tell Athlete's stories in a way that makes change happen, and that there was huge potential to do so.</p> <p>SH asked about the role of Coaches and Athlete Support Personnel in the Social Impact Strategy and Athlete Community. ASM explained that there is a big role for the wider Paralympics GB team in the Social Impact strategy, but that for now, due to resource, this engagement was taking place primarily through NGBs and BPA contacts.</p> <p>HRf noted that the social impact outcomes the BPA is pursuing affect all disabled people, not just Paralympians, and that the BPA should ensure to engage non-athletes in consultations to avoid exacerbating the perceived "them and us" dynamic between athletes and non-athletes that has been perpetuated by similar previous campaigns. PiB suggested a link to the Disability Rights Task Force to support consultation with a group that is not sport focused. FH suggested that consultation with friends and family of para-athletes would also be valuable, and NW noted that it would be valuable to reach out to friends and family of deceased Paralympians when attempting to consult with those on the athlete database.</p> <p>PiB asked for more information on the BPA Parasport programme, and the relationship to the IPC's Para Sport programme. MS clarified that the two are separate programmes, with the IPC's programme introduced as a result of changes to its sponsorship model. JS noted that Toyota, who sponsor the BPA's Parasport programme, had some concerns about the possible conflict and confusion between the programmes, but that these seem to have been addressed and we're working on contract renewal. BPA are also engaging with IPC to discuss how conflict or confusion between the two programmes will be avoided moving forward. ASM explained that it was likely that BPA will need to consider rebranding Parasport, to avoid confusion and any concern from sponsors, but that this could also be an opportunity for a targeted and effective change based on insight about what's worked well in the project to date. PiB agreed that a rebrand posed an opportunity, noting also that it would provide an opportunity to work more closely with Home Nation Disability Sport Organisations on identifying opportunities for participation in disability and inclusive sport.</p>	
--	--	--

3.0	Budget Reforecast	
	<p>DC introduced the item, noting that the BPA are in good financial health though shouldn't become complacent, and invited questions.</p> <p>NW asked about efforts to reduce office costs by finding another organization to share space. MS responded that Exec were having the conversation with other organisations whenever the opportunity arose and noted that the BPA were interested in creating a hub for NGBs, though the BOA are less keen on the idea. HRb, PiB and NW made suggestions for organisations the BPA could approach or alternative locations the BPA could consider and asked what considerations had been given to moving. MS explained that many options had been considered and noted that co-location with the BOA was seen as a significant benefit, however the view of Exec remains that £250K per year is too expensive in the medium and long term for BPA's office space requirements.</p> <p>KA asked about the Foreign Exchange challenges noted in the paper and asked if there were any steps that had been taken to address them. AS noted that the BPA has been working with a partner to secure better and more consistent foreign exchange transaction rates and to develop a partnership approach so that market trends are identified and built into plans. AS also noted that provision was made in the budget to address inflation, and that this was intended to include inflation in the foreign currencies in which we need to transact.</p> <p>KA asked about the budget cycle, and whether it was still appropriate to work within a four-year budget cycle linked to the Paralympiad, when the BPA strategy was becoming less cyclical because of the increased focus on Social Impact. AS responded that, whilst it was the long-term goal to move away from the four-year games cycle in favour of a longer-term outlook, it will not be possible to do so until the BPA has longer term surety of its expected income. It was noted that progress was being made on this, with JS confirming that the BPA was now able to sign multi-games partnerships, with some conditions from the IPC. AS added that the revision of our reserves policy to make provision for LA 2028 was a step in this direction.</p> <p>KA asked whether a change was needed to the BPA's risk appetite, and whether the BPA needs to be risk averse? AS responded that the approach was dependent on the circumstances of the investment – that the BPA could afford to take considered risks in relation to smaller investments, but that larger and longer terms investments are currently less certain until the outlook for possible income is clearer. AS indicated that the point to reconsider risk appetite will be following the December budget reforecast. ASM noted that Exec are giving consideration to discretionary spend which could be adjusted depending on the outcomes of the December reforecast.</p> <p>KA and HRb thanked Exec for the quality of the paper, and the work that has been done to achieve the current financial position. MS and AS extended their thanks to the whole BPA team, for their contribution and their approach to financial sustainability.</p>	<p>AS to update on Risk Appetite following December reforecast.</p>
4.0	Risk Dashboard	
	<p>JC joined the meeting to introduce the Strategic Risk Dashboard, explaining that Board will undertake an in-depth review of risk in July each year, that a dashboard will be provided at each Board Meeting, and that Board will be updated monthly on the most serious new risks.</p> <p>NW felt that the dashboard painted a pessimistic picture that did not reflect the reality of the BPA's current position. PiB asked why the dashboard</p>	

	<p>influence the BPA has to deliver its social impact strategy. ASM noted additional external risks including Channel 4 privatisation and the potential for changes to Government investment in sport. NW suggested including broader categories of external risk within the risk register.</p> <p>HRf asked about the risk related to the LA 2028 competition schedule, and whether the BPA could influence those selections. PeB responded that the BPA has traditionally taken a neutral stance on selection of sports for each Games and noted that GB has been able to medal in new sports as well as being impacted by the removal of sports in which we've previously performed well.</p> <p>FD noted that Cyber-attacks pose a significant and potentially very impactful risk and felt that this could be better reflected in the risk register. PiB echoed this comment, and noted that Safeguarding was another significant reputational risk, though HRb noted that it was important to be clear on the role the BPA could play in this area compared to NGBs and UKS.</p>	
5.0	<p>Governance</p> <p>CC Joined the meeting.</p>	
5.1	<p>Governance Priorities and Code Compliance</p> <p>RT introduced the Governance priorities paper, explaining the rationale for the review of the BPA's governance framework which has been undertaken, and outlining the key priorities in governance for the upcoming six to twelve months.</p> <p>PiB noted that on the list of potential Board and Staff training topics, she would have expected to see Safeguarding. CC confirmed that safeguarding training will be scheduled for staff and Board members.</p> <p>HRb noted that she had not seen the members' handbook since joining the BPA Board; she asked if the members' handbook could include anything around member engagement, expectations of activities and/or support of BPA priorities. RT agreed to share the latest version of the handbook and noted that the handbook does contain some of that content but noted that any changes to the handbook must be approved by the membership at AGM – we need to be mindful of including too many demands. NW noted that the original proposal for the Member Handbook was accompanied by a detailed explanatory note.</p> <p>PiB referred to RT's point around checking members' compliance with our handbook's obligations, saying that it would be important to pick the most important obligations and finding a way to monitor compliance without imposing an onerous administrative burden. That might include looking for ways to make use of compliance reporting that members already do. RT responded that the intention will be to use publicly available information or links to other organisations (e.g., UKAD or UKS) to gain assurance where possible, to minimise what is being asked of members.</p> <p>FD noted that whilst he fully supported the need to focus on tangible aspects of governance and compliance, most of the recent examples of problematic matters coming to light in the sport sector have been the result of cultural issues. Although the BPA will not be the sole arbiter or monitor in many such instances, we do have a role to play particularly that of promoting and fostering a healthy environment for all in Paralympic sports. CC agreed and said that we do run staff awareness sessions to make people aware of potential issues and what our staff's responsibilities are. That would include staff being alert to examples of unhealthy cultures or</p>	<p>RT to share Members Handbook with Board.</p>

	<p>poor practice when visiting sports and understanding that the BPA would expect to raise any such examples with the relevant member. MS added that if we received no response or an inadequate from the member, we would raise the matter with UK Sport.</p> <p>NW asked how Board could best deal with the upcoming activities listed in the paper. PiB noted it would be useful to decide in advance how each activity would be considered and approved by Board. RT agreed to distribute a list of the upcoming actions with a proposal on how the Board should address each one, so that the approach could be agreed.</p>	<p>RT to circulate Action list for Board to consider.</p>
5.2	<p>Safeguarding Policies</p> <p>CC introduced the updated safeguarding policies, explaining the process of consultation with the NSPCC Child Protection in Sport Unit and the Ann Craft Trust and providing an overview of the major changes to each policy.</p> <p>NW and MS thanked CC for her work in this area. HRb asked for clarity on the volume of complaints under these policies, and CC confirmed that only a small number of complaints have been received. FD noted it was good to hear examples of the policies working in practice.</p> <p>The safeguarding policies were approved.</p>	
5.3	<p>Athletes' Commission ToR</p> <p>CC introduced the new Athlete Commission Terms of Reference and summarised the key amendments.</p> <p>PiB and HR asked a clarifying question on the nature of the proposed Athlete Commission sub-groups. It was suggested that each sub-group have clear review time limits to ensure that each group is serving a clear purpose.</p> <p>NW asked for clarity in relation to the Chair appointment process. CC and RT explained the process, and NW asked that the wording of the policy be adjusted to ensure greater clarity.</p> <p>The Athlete Commission terms of reference were approved.</p>	<p>RT and CC to adjust AC Chair appointment wording.</p>
5.4	<p>Committee Minutes</p> <p>The minutes of the Athlete Commission, Classification Advisory Group and Social Impact Committee were noted by the Board. Verbal updates were provided in relation to recent Sport Committee, Development Committee, Athlete Commission and Classification Advisory Group meetings.</p>	
6.0	<p>Any other business</p>	
	<p>NW noted that an IPC meeting to discuss Russia and Belarus has been preliminarily scheduled to take place in mid-November.</p> <p>NW reminded Board Members of the annual performance evaluation process, which will be undertaken in the coming months.</p> <p>NW and MS updated on efforts to secure financial support for the Ukrainian NPC, including a meeting with the Sports Minister. Several avenues are being explored and conversations are ongoing. A discussion ensued on other potential opportunities.</p> <p>NW confirmed that the November NPC, Election Meeting and AGM will take place on 28 November. HRb asked for confirmation of the election process – RT agreed to share a summary of the process with Board.</p>	<p>RT to share Election</p>

		Process with Board.
	NW closed the meeting at 16:30	