

Minutes Greater Manchester Moving Main Board Meeting

Date	27/03/2025
Time	9:30 - 12:30
Location	St Thomas Centre, Ardwick Green North, Manchester, M12 6FZ
Chair	Mike Perls MBE
Attendees	Sarling, Joe, Will Baker, Sally Carr MBE, Lee Davies, Richard Davis, Leanne Feeley, Jill Harrison, Abigail Irozuru, Hayley Lever, Mike Perls MBE, Steven Pleasant MBE and Matt Stocks

1 Welcome, introduction, and apologies

9:30

Minutes:

Apologies: Sarah Brown-Fraser, Rob Mukherjee, Warren Heppolette, Rachael Ntongho, Dan Cropper.

Additional attendee: Caroline Grime

Mike introduced the meeting. He thanked those involved for their hard work on the business plan. He also spoke of the fantastic strategy day (in February) and how it gave the board the themes to focus on for the rest of the year.

2 Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising

9:35

Minutes:

All present approved the minutes from the previous meeting.

Matt provided an update on his action from the previous board meeting regarding the continued involvement of former trustees. He confirmed that this will be integrated into the off-boarding process moving forward. A menu of opportunities will be created, and once it's finalised, he will reconnect with trustees who have recently stepped down.

All other actions complete.

3 Nominations and Remuneration

9:40

Minutes:

APDR paper (sent separately to the board):

The Exec team and Hayley left the meeting for this section

Steven introduced a discussion on the APDR paper, which contains recommendations requiring approval from the board.

- *The process has been endorsed by the board and aligns with the values of the organisation.*

- *It is designed to be transparent, open, and fair, ensuring that staff feel rewarded and valued.*
- *It remains within budget.*

Steven's conclusions:

1. *The team have gone through a robust APDR process including moderation. It would be wrong not to go ahead with the recommendations for the current year.*
2. *A review is required of the APDR processes.*

Lee left the meeting, and the discussion continued privately with the trustees.

Lee and Hayley were invited back into the meeting.

Steven shared the outcome of the trustee discussion:

- *The board approve the recommendation for this year's APDR.*
- *There is an agreement that the organisation need to review the APDR process.*
- *There will be delegated authority to Will and Steven but involving all trustees as well as Hayley and Lucy Maxwell Scott.*
- *The Exec Team need to draft communications to the team to include context, process and timescales.*
- *It was also agreed not to include a budget line for the APDR process for 2026/7, but to separate out COLA from APDR and include an APDR line in a contingency budget.*

Matt, Richard, Joe, and Caroline re-joined the meeting.

N&Rs Paper

Steven highlighted 3 main areas from the attached paper:

1. After a year of transition, the Executive Team has realigned the structure to ensure the right skills and capacity are in place, equipping us to deliver on our key priorities over the next two years.
2. The findings from the National Active Partnership People Survey closely align with those of our internal staff survey. Moving forward, we plan to streamline our approach by reducing the number of surveys from three to two, retaining the AP version alongside one internal.
3. This quarter featured a Team Day centred on safeguarding and welfare, reinforcing their importance and enabling meaningful, cross organisational dialogue on these critical areas.

Minutes:

Will introduced the finance papers (Finance Report, and Risks).

He informed the trustees that when the new trustee is appointed they will be included in the A&R committee.

Finance Budget

Caroline presented slides on the financial budget.

- Localities funding from the Place Partnership work is included for the first time.
- All income included in the budget is contracted and secure.

Trustee feedback:

Mike asked whether digital transformation is included in the budget, given its role in the Business Plan, and whether it falls under the IT budget line. Richard confirmed that it has not yet been identified as an investment. Mike highlighted potential gaps that could arise from a bottom-up budgeting approach. Richard noted that digital transformation is more likely to be funded from reserves rather than the core budget. Hayley clarified that work has yet to be undertaken to determine the allocation of funds. Mike stressed the importance of the board being aware of additional budgetary considerations.

Mike requested further details on cost efficiencies. Caroline reported that efforts are ongoing within the Active Partnership Network to identify efficiencies in areas such as insurance and training, ensuring budgets are used effectively.

Jill asked about the increase in programme delivery costs. Caroline confirmed that this was due to the expansion of Place Partnership work.

Hayley raised the question of whether digital transformation should be part of the core budget or funded from reserves. Will emphasised the importance of assigning meaningful, costed figures to these investments. Mike pointed out the unusual nature of presenting a Business Plan with defined objectives that are not linked to a specific budget, using digital transformation as an example. Jill suggested that having a clearly visible budget allocation for such initiatives would help with prioritisation and cost estimation.

Steven asked if the Business Plan should be more explicit in how it aligns with the budget. Matt clarified that the Business Plan provides strategic direction, while the budgeting process can be developed accordingly.

Will noted that it would be appropriate for specific budgetary figures included in the business plan to be an initial estimate. Jill emphasised the need for GM Moving to define an ambition with a corresponding budget to assess feasibility.

The Board and Executive Team discussed the potential inclusion of an

additional budget line for seed funding for new, cross cutting areas of the business plan e.g. digital, environmental sustainability, EEDI.

Richard sought confirmation to proceed with the core budget, ensuring it reflects business-as-usual operations without additional strategic ambitions. Mike advocated for both a core budget and a stretch budget.

Richard suggested revisiting the topic of stretch budget/reserves investment at the NRC and ARC meetings in May, to include outcomes of discussions currently taking place with Strategic Leads.

Will agreed that a stretch budget should be presented to the full board in June.

The budget was approved with the following actions to be implemented:

- Separate out APDR as a contingency.
- Develop a stretch budget incorporating currently excluded Business Plan elements and vision/ambition proposals.

Risks: It was agreed to cover the risks paper in more detail at the June board meeting.

5 Business plan 2025 - 2027

10:40

Minutes:

Matt presented the Business Plan slides, underlining the attention paid to our wider ambitions and how it now incorporates key themes from the recent away day.

Hayley reflected on the importance of measurement, evaluation, and learning, highlighting GM Moving's approach as an opportunity to shape future ambitions and establish national leadership. She acknowledged Niamh Carroll's valuable contribution in stepping up during Hazel Musgrove's and Kay Searcey's absence and driving progress forward. The clarity now achieved in the Theory of Change process was recognised as a key milestone in recent months.

Matt praised the collective effort contributed by the team over a focused and intensive three to four-month period. He confirmed that the Business Plan reflects substantial input from across the team and board. While the Priority Plans are still being finalised and designed, he assured that they will be shared shortly. The inclusion of recorded Priority Plan presentations was welcomed, offering a more engaging format and supporting improved knowledge sharing across the organisation.

Jill noted that ESG is well-represented but we should be cautious with its use, as it typically represents a unified policy covering environmental, social, and governance areas. Currently, our focus is on the 'E' (environment), and while we'll need to integrate everything at some point, we should continue to focus on this approach for now. Other aspects of ESG are covered in other areas of the work.

Sally commended the inclusion of safeguarding in the considerations, ensuring it aligns with the overall objectives. She also emphasised the importance of incorporating psychological safety into the plan, noting it as a critical element.

Matt emphasised the importance of defining leadership and champion roles with greater clarity.

Leanne inquired about the primary audience for the Business Plan and key milestones over the next two years. Hayley explained that while the Business Plan is primarily for internal use, it is also shared externally. She added that the Priority Plans will outline change measurement and monthly reflections, contributing to various reports to investors- Sport England, NHS GM and GMCA with a more streamlined/one system approach.

Will highlighted the governance structure and financial goals as key enablers, recommending the inclusion of a financial summary. Hayley proposed adding a pie chart to illustrate the primary funding sources. Will also suggested greater emphasis on our well-established governance and risk management practices, pointing out the strength of the frameworks we've already put in place.

Mike observed that while governance considerations are well-addressed, there is a gap in specific details regarding training and development. Hayley confirmed that more comprehensive information is outlined in the Priority Plans and People Plan.

Will suggested that the heading "Optimising Technology" is too passive and might require rewording. Jill commented that we will need to be clear how technology supports operations.

Matt conveyed feedback from Sarah Brown-Fraser that for the plan to be inclusive, it must also be accessible. This will be addressed in the final design, by Oliver Thompson from the Marketing Team

The discussion concluded with the following actions to support the sign-off of the Business Plan:

- Finalise and distribute the Priority Plans upon their completion
- Integrate psychological safety into the Business Plan.
- Include a financial summary.
- Reassess the positioning of key sections, moving aspects of MEL higher up and restructuring slightly.
- Reword the technology section and check for clarity in its aims.
- Enhance the accessibility of the Business Plan.

6 Break

11:05

Minutes:

Joe presented the strategy paper, with the aim being to gather feedback to refine a viable support services proposal for the A&R, N&R committees and the June Board.

The discussion focused on risks, future-proofing, and the broader objective of increasing influence. Joe stated that the paper seeks to elevate the organisation's role in support services, ensuring all related activities are strategically aligned.

Joe commented that in terms of bench-marking, conversations have led to greater ambition in this area, reinforced by discussions at the Away Day. He confirmed the focus is on trade-offs and priorities, assessing the organisation's current position and potential opportunities.

Joe shared that at the moment the organisation is engaged in several key activities:

1. The Business Plan and Priority Plans have been structured to explore the potential offer.
2. A range of influencing activities is underway, assessing the external offer.
3. Direct responses to opportunities, such as work in the Liverpool City Region and participation in global conferences, are helping to validate the concept of supporting external entities. While the full scope remains unclear, the organisation is well-positioned to expand this work.
4. There is also consideration of commercialising assets, ensuring any income-generating activities are approached responsibly and with reputational risks in mind. GM Moving aims to act as a partner rather than a consultant, maintaining its integrity while exploring these opportunities.

Joe highlighted that looking ahead, efforts will focus on designing and structuring this work effectively. GM Moving will develop a logic model and clarify the rationale, ensuring a more strategic approach to selecting partners and focus areas.

Joe stated that capacity and capability building will be essential both internally and externally, with this additional focus representing a further stretch internally. Joe shared that externally, partnerships will be key, particularly those that push boundaries and align with ambitious objectives.

Joe concluded that all these elements contribute to the longer-term goal of developing a trading arm for support services, creating a distinct entity separate from the charity.

Joe asked for feedback:

Leanne raised the question of support service possibilities and how profits would be reinvested.

Jill emphasised the need for a more focused plan of action, including a clear approach and timeline.

Will discussed demonstrating support for charitable objectives and agreed that establishing a subsidiary made sense to protect the charity. He also highlighted the need to take legal and taxation advice and to manage commercial risk through a trading arm separate from the charity. He noted that commercial activities should be managed day to day, citing the example of individuals employed by the charity while working for the trading arm.

Mike asked about how the organisation began working with Liverpool. Hayley confirmed that they were commissioned, and Richard added that future engagements would likely be contractual. Mike then asked Joe how much of his time was focused on this work. Joe explained that he currently has half a day to a full day per week allocated, with wider team involvement depending on who was needed. Hayley stressed the importance of clarity on executive roles in the plan so the contribution of each is clear.

Steven asked what would be presented at the June board meeting. Joe responded that a paper would outline specific activities, structure, and capacity. It would include a first-year plan detailing what the organisation aims to achieve.

Mike addressed the external environment, stating that steps must be taken to ensure sustainability. He emphasised the importance of prioritising growth areas while managing the risk of conflicting messages, noting the significant opportunity available. He questioned whether the £135k budget was sufficient and questioned the level of commitment, asking whether dedicating only half a day per week demonstrated a committed approach.

Abigail asked about the status of the books Hayley is working on. Hayley confirmed that work was ongoing and that two books were scheduled for publication this year.

Richard asked Mike about risk mitigation strategies. Mike suggested selling the initiative, creating a network, and building the offer based on existing opportunities. He stated that a capacity problem would be a positive challenge, as it would require an investment decision.

Hayley asked what else should be included in the June meeting. Sally proposed revisiting the parameters, defining what the organisation would and would not do, and identifying unique aspects to mitigate reputational risks. She also suggested considering the potential consequences of commercial activities, such as charging for conferences and speakers.

Steven requested to have more concrete updates before the June board meeting.

Hayley suggested continuing the discussion outside of the meeting and working on a shared document to facilitate collaboration- taking this through A&R, N&R committees then onto Board. She asked trustees who

would be willing to help with this process. Mike, Abigail and Jill offered their support.

8

AOB

12:20

Minutes:

Hayley reminded the trustees that they can claim expenses for the support they give to GM Moving.

Hayley invited all trustees to come along to the GM Moving conference.