



# BRITISH FENCING

Minutes of the British Fencing (BF) Board meeting held at the BOA, London

Monday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2012 at 17.30

Approved by the Board on the 18<sup>th</sup> April 2012

<b>Present</b>		
David Teasdale	Director and Chair	DT/Chair
Andrew Brannon	Director	AB
Murray Morrison	Director	MM
Alp Orge	Director	AO
Libby Payne	Director	LP
David King	Director	DK
Penny Spink MBE	Director	PS
Keith Smith	Director	KS
Piers Martin	Director and Chief Executive	PM/CEO

<b>Also in attendance (non-voting)</b>		
Ray Stafford	England Fencing Representative	RS
Louise Bond-Williams	Athlete Commission Representative	LBW
Jack Magill	Northern Ireland Representative	JM
Alex Newton	Performance Manager	AN

<b>Apologies for absence</b>		
Mike Thornton	Director	MT
Chris Hyde	Scotland Fencing Representative	CH
Bob Turner	Wales Fencing Representative	BT

REF	MINUTE	ACTION
<b>1.</b>	<b><u>Chair's Welcome</u></b>	
1.1	The Chair welcomed everyone to the British Olympic Association BOA and noted apologies as above.	
<b>2.</b>	<b><u>Conflicts of Interest</u></b>	
2.1	The Chair noted the following conflicts in relation to the Agenda and agreed to manage them as required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- DT: Is spending a period of time helping his old company <i>Goodform</i>, a company which has received payment for services to British Fencing; this is during a transition caused by health issues in which the Chair had no involvement</li><li>- AO: Is an equipment supplier.</li></ul>	
<b>3.</b>	<b><u>Minutes of the last meeting</u></b>	
3.1	It was noted that the minutes of the meeting held on the 13 <sup>th</sup> December 2011 were approved at a meeting of the Directors on the 18 <sup>th</sup> January 2012.	
3.2	There were no matters arising.	
<b>4.</b>	<b><u>Chair Report</u></b>	
4.1	The Chair updated the Board on the activity of the membership working group, explaining that the aim was to launch the scheme this year, based on the proposals supported by the Board and supported by the home countries' Boards.	
4.2	He added that a working group comprising RS, PS and CH was working on the implementation	

	plan which may include a test programme in Scotland.	
	He explained that currently BF had many priorities to deal with – including the vital preparations for the Games – but that the UK Sport and Sport England submissions for the 13-17 cycle were being given the necessary priority.	
<b>5.</b>	<b><u>British Championships</u></b>	
5.1	DT explained that this had been put back on the agenda as Hazel Herbert (HH) had requested clear guidance from the Board on the competition for this year.	
5.2	AO explained to the Board that he had taken his suggestions (circulated previously to Board members) on improving the British Championships to HH but was encountering misunderstandings.	
5.3	KS expressed concern that BF committees should accept Board direction.	
5.4	DT noted that because of the late Board intervention which had led to moving the British Championships in 2011, he could understand the request for a Board directive.	
5.5	PM suggested that he arrange a meeting between AO and Hazel Herbert to establish clear roles and responsibilities. The Board agreed with this approach.	PM/AO
<b>6.</b>	<b><u>GREEN</u></b>	
6.1	<u>Governance Audit</u> PM notified the Board that the on-site Audit from Moore Stephens on behalf of UK Sport and Sport England would take place in April. He informed the Board that the main issues for resolution were around Board skills, appraisals and development plus training and risk management.	
6.2	<u>Strategic Delivery Plan (SDP)</u> PM presented the draft SDP and repeated his request that Board Directors contact relevant staff members for their portfolio in order to help finalise the plan.	All
6.3	<u>Grow</u> The Chair updated the Board on the work of the Grow Group. He explained that BF had engaged with Corporate Culture, behaviour change consultants, who were assisting with the work of the group and with the 13-17 submission.	
<b>7.</b>	<b><u>GOLD</u></b>	
7.1	AN gave a presentation on the ‘Project Rio’ submission to UK Sport:	
7.2	The submission will be judged on the business case presented to UK Sport by BF on three areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recent track record</li> <li>- System in place</li> <li>- Known performers.</li> </ul>	
7.3	BF will have to prove these elements of the business plan to UK Sport first in a submission and then a presentation in October, both with clear evidence.	
7.4	BF had not achieved any of the milestone targets set for the Olympiad and so the “track record” case and discussion would be challenging.	
7.5	The System Profile (where we are now) identified four key risks to the programme as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leadership and management from the Board down</li> <li>- Facilities</li> <li>- Talent Recruitment</li> <li>- Coaches.</li> </ul>	
7.6	There are two key levels based on medals at World and Olympic Games: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Podium (next Olympic Games)</li> <li>- Podium Potential (future Olympic Games)</li> </ul>	
7.7	Known performers would be identified by a comparison with the World’s best.	
7.8	KS informed the Board that when he had asked the French if they could identify athletes for Rio, they had responded “no”. He requested to know how the Performance Advisory Group (PAG) would select athletes.	

7.9	AN noted that the Board had agreed the PAG, set up for London 2012 specifically, would not be making selection decisions and pointed out that UK Sport would have to verify any athletes proposed for the Rio Cycle based on evidence of podium or podium potential.	
7.10	KS raised concerns on how this approach would affect the allocation of Host Nation Places for London 2012.	
7.11	DT noted that the Board had already made the decision to align with UK Sport and fill Host Nation Places with medal potential for London or for Rio.	
7.12	RS advised the Board that the question for the Directors was - do they want to seek funding from UK Sport - if so, it was inevitable that rules would be associated with this funding.	
7.13	AN went on to explain that there would be two strands of funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Core funding, which was athlete based</li> <li>- Co-funding, which was partnership funding with the NGB based on athlete total plus contribution.</li> </ul>	
7.14	DT reported the “good news” that UK Sport believe Fencing has athletes with the potential to win medals at World and Olympic level and was prepared to invest.	
7.15	The Board thanked AN for her presentation and gave the go ahead for her to finalise the summary submission to UK Sport. Directors hoped the bid would be successful.	
<b>8.</b>	<b><u>Olympic Selection Panel</u></b>	
8.1	The Board discussed possible candidates and, in accordance with Section 14 of the Olympic Selection Policy, appointed the following (subject to the CEO checking availability): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Philip Kimberley</li> <li>- Dominic Mahony</li> <li>- Derek Mapp</li> </ul>	PM
8.2	The Board instructed the CEO to liaise with Sports Resolutions and to appoint a non-voting Chair of the panel in accordance with Section 14 of the Olympic Selection Policy.	PM
<b>9.</b>	<b><u>Any other business</u></b>	
9.1	<u>International Relations Committee (IRC) FIE/EFC Candidate Proposals:</u> The Board received proposals from the IRC for potential candidates for the FIE and EFC and agreed to reflect on the list to agree at the next meeting.	
9.2	<u>Shirley Parker correspondence:</u> The Chair informed the Board that he had received a letter from Shirley Parker regarding honours for Allan Jay.	
9.3	It was agreed that DT would write to Ms Parker explaining the process.	
<b>10.</b>	<b><u>Date of the next meeting</u></b>	
10.1	The date of the next Board meeting would be circulated for April.	DT/PM
<b>11.</b>	<b><u>Close</u></b>	
11.1	The Chair closed the meeting at 19.30.	