


<b>FINAL Minutes: Badminton GB Board Limited Meeting</b>		
<b>Friday 9 July 2021 – 2pm to 3pm</b>		
<b>Venue: Via Zoom online</b>		
<b>Board:</b>	Stephen Baddeley (SB)	Chair and Non-Executive Director
	Kelly Aston (KA)	Director (Badminton Wales)
	Derek Batchelor (DB)	Director (Badminton England)
	Christine Black (CB)	Director (Badminton Scotland)
	Adrian Christy (AC)	Accountable Officer
	Graeme Finch (GF)	Non-Executive Director
	Stephen Farrow (SF)	Company Secretary/Non-Executive Director
	Ken Nixon (KN)	Director (Badminton Ireland, Ulster Branch)
	Priya Guha (PG)	Non-Executive Director
<b>Apologies:</b>	Jon Austin	Performance Director

	Topic
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Welcome and scene setting</b></p> <p>SB welcomed the Board members and thanked them for making themselves available for this interim GB Badminton Board meeting.</p> <p>Before proceeding with the meeting SB requested consent of the Board Members to record the meeting so as the Minutes of the Meeting could be typed up at a later date due to no minute taker being available today. The Board unanimously agreed to this request.</p> <p>SB confirmed that everyone had received all the relevant paperwork in advance of the meeting and the email received from Jonny Wynne, Governance Manager at UK Sport on 8<sup>th</sup> July, which summarised the key points made by JW in a recent conversation SB had had with him.</p> <p>SB handed over to AC who shared some of his reflections of a practical solution for going forward following the previous Board meeting and a summary of some conversations that had taken place with the CEO of Badminton Scotland, the BE Board and the CEO of UK Sport. In explaining why he was recommending revisiting the MOU, he stated that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the next 3 to 4 years evolve and we look at the funding conditions attached to the Award, at some stage, the MOU would have to be revisited.</li> <li>• The Board would retain the decision making and governance over any changes that might come about as a consequence of editing or putting aspects of the clauses into an operational plan each year and would be signed off by the GB Badminton Board each year.</li> </ul> <p>AC summarised the history of the journey around obtaining a united agreement on the MOU for the benefit of SF who is new to the GB Badminton Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The two principal reasons Badminton Scotland will not sign the MOU are;</li> </ul>

- The statement that Performance personnel will be joint GB/BE positions
- The statement that the centralised centre will be at Milton Keynes

He said that the CEO of Badminton Scotland, speaking on behalf of the Board of BS, argues that those two items should be afforded more flexibility by being removed from the MOU and placed in something like an annual operational plan.

- If a GB athlete decided that MK, as the current centralised training environment, wasn't the optimum performance environment for the player, then the players that train outside of MK should not be automatically precluded from accessing funding.
- AC believes that this approach could be managed through an operational plan that sits alongside the MOU.

AC asked the Board to reconsider revisiting the MOU in order to accommodate the two key reasons identified above.

A detailed discussion took place among the Board Members on their thoughts around how this proposal could be taken forward and SB summarised the Board's comments as follows;

- The proposal is that the paperwork will be reformatted but keep the status quo.
- It is not the intention to change Milton Keynes as the current centralised training venue.
- If there was a request from any Home Nation against the programme management to change the centralised programme location it would have to be a robust proposal for the GB Badminton Board to approve.
- Any annual Operational Plan should only be discussed and agreed at the GB Badminton Board and approval would not be the responsibility of the Home Nations.
- An annual Operational Plan is a decision document based on the lead Home Nation perspective of how to get the best out of athletes influenced by the Technical Advisory Group.
- The Home Nations would be signing the reworded MOU prior to sight of the Operational Plan.

## 2. Update from UK Sport

Email received from Jonny Wynne and circulated prior to the meeting. The key statement in this email was;

*UK Sport encourages and supports BGB to explore all options in order to reach a resolution on the MOU. Therefore, it is our view that it would be beneficial for the Board to revisit the MOU with the aim of reaching a solution that all home nations are in agreement with.*

### **Cultural Health Check / UK Sport Review**

*Additional notes added by DB on 28.10.21 as minuted in Board meeting on 29 Sep (minute 3.1.1)*

"PG expressed the view that she did not have the necessary information to understand what was to take place and/or when in relation to the Cultural Health Check to be undertaken by UK Sport.

AC replied that the terms of reference for the review would be drafted within the next couple of weeks and that the review would follow an eight week process involving the players, performance management, and the Badminton England / BGB Boards. He added that Badminton

	<p>England may instigate a far deeper review of its own as some parents of younger players had also expressed concern. He felt that the current situation vis-à-vis player unrest had been created because of the selection processes used (particularly in relation to the Tokyo Olympics), adding that many sports were in a similar position with regard to player challenges.</p> <p>SB felt that he was insufficiently close to the situation to comment but recognised that much disquiet had been fostered via social media and that this gave rise to speculation as to whether there were underlying problems at Milton Keynes. SF noted that the adverse comment in the social media / press was not just about the working of the selection and appeals processes but that more than half had been about the culture at Milton Keynes. He added that KA had been involved in the selection process and that he had been involved in the appeals process, adding that he was, and remained, comfortable with the decisions reached (although feeling that the selection process required greater clarity going forwards).</p> <p>It was agreed that a scoping group would be established with regard to the terms of reference for the review. The composition of the group was confirmed as: SB/Mike Robinson/AC/PG/ and ANO (being a member of the Board of Badminton England).</p> <p>AC agreed to supply PG with a timeline of the activities to be undertaken.”</p>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Options for consideration</b>
	<p>Following a conversation with UK sport and the email referred to above, Adrian, as Accountable Officer, feels we need to redouble efforts to find a solution that does not leave BS detached from GB Badminton.</p>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Decision on way forward and next steps</b>
	<p>Taking on board the advice of AC and the strong guidance from UK Sport, the Board reversed its previous decision and unanimously agreed that the best way forward is to work with Badminton Scotland to agree limited revisions to the MOU that address the two principal concerns identified by BS.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS ARISING:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. AC to ask Jonny Wynne for an Operational Plan template to understand the level of detail required.</li> <li>2. Graeme Finch and Derek Batchelor to work together to form a redrafted MOU taking into account the two areas of concern of Badminton Scotland and circulate to AC as CEO of Badminton England and Accountable Officer of GB Badminton and Kelly Aston, CEO of Sport Wales in the first instance before onward circulation to Stephen Baddeley, Chair of GB Badminton, and Keith Russell, CEO of Badminton Scotland.</li> <li>3. Final draft of revised MOU and LHNC are to be presented to the September Board Meeting for approval.</li> </ol>