

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 27 JUNE 2011

PRESENT

Helen Alexander	Co-Opted Member
Patricia Lankester	Chair, Senior Trustee
Monisha Shah	Trustee
Jules Sher QC	Co-Opted Member
Wolfgang Tillmans	Trustee
Nicholas Serota	Director
Alex Beard	Deputy Director
Rebecca Williams	Director of Development
Masina Frost	Head of Director's Office
[REDACTED]	Head of Corporate Development
[REDACTED]	Governance and Policy Manager (notes)
Caroline Collier	Director, Tate National (for items 6 & 7)
[REDACTED]	Head of National and International Initiatives (for items 6 & 7)

1 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies; it was noted that Monisha Shah would join the meeting as soon as possible. The Chair reminded members and staff attendees of the advisory nature of the Committee.

2 REVIEW OF CORPORATE RELATIONSHIPS

The Committee were asked to highlight any concerns with the portfolio of corporate relationships as presented in the report, with particular reference to any potential damage to Tate's mission, whether actual or reputational.

It was agreed that there were no particular concerns with any of Tate's current corporate relationships. *Information has been exempted under Section 43 (2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000*

Item 3 is not relevant to the request

4 SPONSORSHIP RENEWAL

4.1 BP

The terms of the sponsorship renewal discussion were outlined and *Information has been exempted under Section 43 (2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000* was highlighted. It was noted that both quantifiable and reputational risk should be considered, and that the test for refusal of funds towards charitable objectives remained high. It was noted that previous similar discussions by the Ethics Committee had recommended the continuation of a high-level working relationship with BP even in the face of reputational considerations, and that the situation had improved since these previous discussions.

The Committee recommended that the sponsorship with BP be renewed according to the terms outlined in the report.

Items 5, 6 and 7 are not relevant to the request

8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

Ethics Committee, held on Thursday 6 May 2010

The Ethics Committee met to discuss BP's ongoing sponsorship of Tate Britain, in the light of recent adverse press coverage of the environmental consequences of BP's activities, the specific criticism of Tate by a number of activist groups and a number of related press enquiries to Tate about our continued relationship with BP.

- The Committee considered BP's activity alongside Tate's Ethical Fundraising Policy (part of Tate's Ethics Policy) and considered that currently there was no evidence to suggest that the acceptance of funds from BP would significantly damage the effective operation of Tate.
- The Committee however acknowledged that this might change in the future.
- The Committee considered that it was not Tate's role to make moral decisions of another companies' activities where they stood outside Tate's charitable objectives, but rather to consider the acceptance of funds against our own ethical fundraising policy.
- *Information has been exempted under Section 42 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000*
- The Committee considered the acceptance of funds alongside Tate's sustainability strategy, noting that fundraising was not explicitly referenced in the strategy.
- In conclusion, the Committee:
 - Recommended the continuation of the current relationship with BP.
 - *Information is not relevant to the request*
 - *Information is not relevant to the request*

Ethics Committee held on Monday 1 November 2010

- There were no apologies. In addition to the Committee, Nicholas Serota, Alex Beard, Rebecca Williams, Masina Frost and [REDACTED] were present.
- The Committee was updated on public concern around the sponsorship of Tate by BP since their last meeting in May, which appeared to have reduced significantly since its peak in mid summer.
- The Committee discussed in principle issues around judging when public concern might be seen detrimentally to affect the ability of Tate to fulfil its mission either through harming key relationships, creating unacceptable conflicts of interest or damaging Tate's reputation. *Information has been exempted under Section 42 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000*
- *Information is not relevant to the request*
- It was noted that, in considering issues which might 'detrimentally affect' the ability of Tate to fulfil its mission, it is the role of Trustees to come to a reasoned judgment, taking full account of the information before them and seeking advice as necessary.
- It was suggested that Tate consider first whether accepting funds from a particular donor is a good thing to do and secondly consider issues of reputation and relationship impairment.
- *Information is not relevant to the request*
- It was agreed that internal communications would be undertaken to emphasise the principles and guidelines and to clarify how staff can escalate any concerns that might arise.

Ethics Committee meeting held on Monday 27 June 2011

- The full range of Tate's current and prospective corporate relationships was considered. The Committee raised no concerns regarding Tate's current portfolio of supporters *Information has been exempted under Section 43 (2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000*
- *Information is not relevant to the request*
- *Information is not relevant to the request*
- The Committee recommended the renewal of sponsorship by BP *Information has been exempted under Section 43 (2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000*
- *Information is not relevant to the request*
- *Information is not relevant to the request*
- *Information is not relevant to the request*