

***CONFIDENTIAL***  
***ANNEXE: C***

To the Independent Review  
into Child Sexual Abuse in  
Football 1970 – 2005

*Clive Sheldon QC*

**WARNING**

**This Report contains accounts of child sexual abuse. Those who have given accounts of child sexual abuse are not identified in the Report, save where explicit consent has been provided for this purpose. The identities of those who have given accounts are protected by law. It is a criminal offence pursuant to the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1992 to publish the identity of those who have given accounts of sexual abuse.**

Survivors can access information about the support that is available to them at:  
[www.thefa.com/football-rules-governance/safeguarding/section-9-support-for-survivors](http://www.thefa.com/football-rules-governance/safeguarding/section-9-support-for-survivors)  
as well as directly from the PFA at:  
[www.thepfa.com/charity/survivor-support-advocate](http://www.thepfa.com/charity/survivor-support-advocate).

Helplines outside of football are: NAPAC on their support line: 0808 801 0331  
or NSPCC on their helpline: 0800 023 2642.

(These details are correct at the time of publication. Anyone wishing to access support services in the future should refer to the safeguarding page of The FA's website to check for up-to-date details).

## CONFIDENTIAL ANNEXE: C

1 This Confidential Annexe contains information which was included in chapter 8 of the Report: The FA. It is included in this Confidential Annexe for the FA Board as the criminal trial of Geoffrey Broome has not been concluded. Once the criminal trial is concluded the FA Board may wish to consider publishing this as a public annexe to the full report. In the Report Broome is given the cipher NQ.

2. This Case Study is referenced at 8.2.66 of the Report:

### CASE STUDY GEOFFREY BROOME

Geoffrey Broome serves as a case study of how a professional club sought to manage child protection issues against the backdrop of what the FA was saying about screening. The club (in this case, Scunthorpe United FC) sought to balance different interests: namely its concern for children playing and training for the Club, against the contribution to the Club that was being provided by someone with a history of sexual assault. The Club was put under pressure from a variety of sources: the person directly working with Broome who wanted him to continue providing services to the Club, Broome himself, and third parties who were concerned that children could be brought into contact with the individual.

Broome's example also illustrates how the FA used the FACA membership process as a mechanism through which an individual's involvement with football could be regulated. One of the drawbacks associated with relying on self-certification is also highlighted. In this case, the individual did refer to a previous caution, but he put his own interpretation on the event in question. This seems to have been taken at face value by the FA initially. It was only when the matter was challenged by third parties that the FA looked at the matter again, and applied a more cautious approach.

In 1987, Broome had received a police caution for indecent assault on two boys. This was made known to Scunthorpe United FC several years later when Broome became involved with the Club.

Information about Broome's caution first came to the Club's attention when an anonymous letter was sent to the Club expressing concerns that it was employing a man who had received a caution for indecent assault involving young boys. Broome was asked about this, and he gave the Club authority to obtain a copy of his caution from the police. A senior police officer wrote to the Club on March 25th 1996: "In relation to the offences admitted in 1987 it would be fair to point out that on a scale of 1 - 10, with '1' being the highest, it is my opinion that these matters could be assessed as falling within the region of 8-10 accordingly." The police officer added that "since these indiscretions, no complaints to my knowledge have been received about Mr. Broome's conduct".

Minutes of the Club's Board meeting on March 28th 1996 refer to the anonymous letter received by the Club, and the subsequent investigations that were carried out

into the matter. A senior officer of the Club is reported to have said:

“Having regard to the information received and what he felt . . . was the club’s moral responsibility to the children that went through the Youth Development Scheme it was [his] opinion that Mr. Broome be relieved of his duties.”

Different views were expressed in discussion about the matter, but it was “generally felt that as children were involved if there was any slight element of risk he should not be employed”. At a Board meeting on April 30th 1996, an individual involved in the youth development setup at the Club (FZ), made a request that Broome be allowed to stay with the Youth Development Scheme. It was agreed that so long as Broome was working alongside another coach and with 16-18 year olds only, he would be allowed to stay. FZ was to be written to and informed that he had personal responsibility for Broome’s future conduct and that the situation would be monitored. This letter was written on May 20th 1996.

On February 26th 1997, FZ wrote to a senior officer of the Club with respect to Broome. He said that he was “aware of the pressures that are being placed on all Football clubs by both the media [presumably referring to the Dispatches documentary (see: Dispatches: Soccer’s Foul Play)] and the Football Association [presumably a reference to Graham Kelly’s letter of January 21st 1997 enclosing the correspondence with the Home Secretary] in employing the right types particularly as they are working with children and I am mindful that it will be necessary for me to reassess the situation on a regular basis”. He could not speak “too highly” of the job that Broome was doing. A list of Broome’s duties and achievements were set out. This included organising a successful tour of Scotland for the under 12s, 14s and 15s in the summer of 1996.

Concerns were subsequently expressed about the tour of Scotland. This was referred to in the Board minutes of July 23rd 1997: “A complaint had been received from a parent following a trip to Scotland by the Youth Development Association. Grave concern was expressed as the organiser Mr. Broome had taken charge unsupervised.” As this was “against the Company policy”, FZ needed to be interviewed about this.

In the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Directors on August 14th 1997, it is recorded that two senior officers of the Club had met with FZ. They informed him that he had not complied with club policy concerning Broome (who was required to be supervised, and not to be involved with under 16s) and issued him a written warning. From the written warning letter of August 19th 1997, it would appear that Broome was unsupervised on the trip to Scotland. FZ was informed that any further recurrence would result in Broome’s removal from the Youth Development Scheme. It was suggested that the players stayed at Pontins Holiday Camp, and that adults had shared rooms with children.

At the next meeting of the Board on September 11th 1997, it was resolved: “In view of the Football Association stance on vetting all newcomers into their academies and refusing employment to those who had received a caution Mr Broome should be dismissed.” (This was presumably a reference to the FA’s recent decision to amend the Programme for Excellence regulations for 1998/99 which would require screening

of those working in Academies (see: Charter for Quality).) It does not appear that Broome was actually dismissed at this point, but he stayed away from the Club while matters were being resolved. On November 25th 1997, Broome wrote to the Club to say that he wished to continue working for them.

In the meantime, correspondence took place between the Club and the Lincolnshire CFA about Broome. On November 17th 1997, the County FA wrote to the Club to say that Broome had to apply to the FACA for membership. It was explained that if all the necessary information was provided to the FA, and Broome received FACA membership, then the County FA would have no hesitation in endorsing this. At the Board meeting of November 27th 1997, it was agreed that if clearance from FACA was obtained, the Club would review the situation with Broome.

Broome made an application to FACA, which was approved on February 5th 1998. Broome had declared his caution, and gave some information about it. Broome described the incident as “accepting a caution for admitting ‘smacking’ on the rear a twelve year old”, something that was done in “humour and was certainly not with any malicious intent”, and was subsequently “blown out of all proportion”. He then set out in detail his involvement in junior football, including coaching hundreds of children. He also referred to the fact that since his caution, he had taken more than 40 tours in the United Kingdom and abroad as tour leader. It seems that the FA took this at face value, and carried out no further investigation.

At the Board meeting of the Club on February 12th 1998, it was said that if approval could be confirmed by the FA, then Broome should be re-engaged to assist FZ with the administration of the Centre for Excellence players. Broome’s FACA membership application was approved, and Broome was re-engaged.

A year later, on March 9th 1999, the Club received a letter from representatives of a couple of junior league teams expressing concerns about Broome’s involvement, wondering whether the Club’s board and FZ were aware when reinstating Broome that he had been cautioned for indecent assault. The Club followed this up with the FA, to check whether Broome had disclosed his caution when he applied for FACA membership. A senior officer of the Club said that the Club was “obviously concerned” about the situation.

At the Club’s Board meeting of March 18th 1999, reference was made in the minutes to a conversation with a Director of the Club, who had been approached by people concerning Broome. The minutes recorded that there had been correspondence with the FA about the matter, and that the Club would be spoken to by the FA about its child protection responsibilities. The FA subsequently confirmed that it was aware of Broome’s caution when he made his FACA application.

The FA received further correspondence about Broome and, on April 9th 1999, Robin Russell wrote to the child protection unit of North Lincolnshire Council social services asking for their opinion as to “whether Mr Broome is a fit and proper person to have conduct of children through his involvement with football”. On April 10th 1999,

Broome was suspended from FACA, pending inquiries. He was told that he should not hold himself out as being a member of FACA. Scunthorpe United FC was notified of this suspension, and informed the FA that they would suspend Broome until the FA had made a decision.

At the Board meeting of April 15th 1999, it was explained that if the FA withdrew membership or if Broome was to be subject to a “conditional licence”, his services should be dispensed with. If the FA upheld his membership, then further matters that had been brought to the Club’s attention would be investigated and Broome’s suspension would continue in the meantime.

The FA considered what should be done with Broome. XX spoke to a senior individual within the social services department who said that “there is nothing in the information provided by us that leads her to believe that children are at risk”, but recommended a risk assessment of Broome if there were concerns about his continuing behaviour. XX explained in a note to Tony Pickerin dated May 4th 1999 that the allegations relating to Broome were not connected with behaviour specifically since the caution but relate solely to the caution. He said:

“The two options available to us seem to me to be to allow Mr Broome to be reinstated completely at this stage with his license or to suggest that the Club carries out an assessment of risk in relation to Mr Broome and his potential or not as a threat to children.”

On May 21st 1999, North Lincolnshire Council social services wrote to the Club to say that they had concerns that:

“[A]n adult with a previous police caution for indecent assault on boys was recruited by the club, possibly knowing his past history and that he is now working in a position where he may be responsible for supervising children and young people.”

There was no basis for social services or the police to carry out a further child protection investigation as there were no current allegations of abuse: it was a matter for the Club or the FA to resolve.

XX sought the advice of the NSPCC about Broome. They advised that as a result of Broome’s previous caution for indecent assault of two boys, he was:

“[A]n unsuitable person to have contact with children, whether in a paid or voluntary capacity through organised football. It is only through such a step that football can be certain that it is safeguarding all children with whom it is involved and that parents and carers of any such children can have confidence that reasonable steps are being taken to ensure their children’s safety.”

As a result of this advice, on August 2nd 1999, XX wrote to Broome to inform him that it was the view of the NSPCC that the caution rendered him “an unsuitable person to have conduct with children, whether in a paid or voluntary capacity, through organised football”. As a result, he was permitted to continue as a FACA member “on the strict understanding that you are not to have any contact with children through your involvement with football”. For these purposes, Broome was told that a child means a

person under the age of 18 years old. Broome was also required to notify the fact of his caution and the conditions of his FACA membership to any prospective organisation or individual with whom he was to have any involvement through football. He was also required to notify the FA of any such individual or organisation for XX's personal attention. Broome was told that a breach of these conditions would render him liable to expulsion from FACA. The letter to Broome was shared with Lincolnshire CFA, and also with Scunthorpe United FC.

Before XX's letter had been sent out, it was decided at the Club's Board meeting of July 19th 1999 that – due to the impending commencement of the Centre of Excellence year – Broome's employment should be terminated. It was stated that if the FA reinstated him, however, the Club would reconsider his application if the position was still available. Broome did not work again for the Club. I consider it most likely that this was because the FA did not reinstate Broome to work with children.

On December 13th 2000, an article appeared in the *Scunthorpe Evening Telegraph*, with the headline: "Sex soccer case man worked for Iron" (Scunthorpe United's nickname), which described an Annual General Meeting of the Club at which criticisms were made of the Club for "employing a man who had indecently assaulted 11-year-old boys". Although the man had not been named at the AGM, the newspaper said that it was Broome.

Further detail about Broome and the FA's approach to him is referred to elsewhere in this report where I deal with how the FA handled case management matters (see: Disciplinary and Referrals).

**3.** The information in the following section is text which is referred to in the Disciplinary and Referrals section of the Report at paragraph 8.3.12.

One individual about whom the FA did become aware during this period was Geoffrey Broome. Broome had been cautioned by the police for indecent assault against two young players involved with his junior football club in 1987. This story was covered in the local media: the *Grimsby Evening Telegraph* had as its main story on the front page of the August 13th 1988 edition under the heading "Football boss resigns after assault on boy", with a picture of Broome alongside. There is no evidence to suggest that this was known to the FA at the time. The situation with Broome first came to the FA's attention in August 1990, when an individual (who I shall refer to as XA), who was secretary of a junior football league, wrote to the FA.

XA had been asked by a parent to prevent Broome from being involved in junior football. XA explained that he had raised the matter with the local County FA (Lincolnshire), and that an emergency meeting of the junior league was arranged at which a County FA representative was present. At the meeting, XA said that the subject of Broome receiving a caution from the police was raised and a letter from the police confirming this was read out. At a subsequent Annual General Meeting of the junior league, XA stated that the County FA representative pressured him not to read out the minutes of the emergency meeting. He claimed that the County FA representative said that if the

minutes were read out, the junior league would be closed down. XA wished to bring this matter to the attention of the FA. XA did not say, in his letter to the FA, that the police caution given to Broome was connected with activity that had taken place in, or around, the football environment, nor did XA describe the nature of the offences admitted by Broome.

The FA responded to XA's letter on September 6th 1990. In a letter from the Chief Executive Graham Kelly, copied into Lincolnshire CFA, it was stated that:

“I am unable to make any further comment as the Annual General Meeting to which you refer is of the above League, which is under the jurisdiction of the Lincolnshire F.A.

However, I feel that the minutes of all meetings must be reported to the member clubs of a League, and this should have happened in this case. A copy of this letter will be sent to the Lincolnshire Football Association to enable it to instruct the League to publish the minutes correctly in order to avoid any suggestion of a cover-up.”

The FA was saying therefore that this was a matter that needed to be dealt with by the County FA. That seems to be an appropriate response to what would have appeared to have been a local matter with no national consequences. There is no reference in the archives to any follow-up by the FA in respect of this matter. From other materials that I have seen, it would appear that the matter was looked at by the County FA, but no further action was taken.

4. The following information is referenced at paragraph 8.3.12 of the Report.

#### **GEOFFREY BROOME**

Another case that the FA asked the NSPCC to look at was that of Geoffrey Broome in 2000. Following the NSPCC's advice, the FA imposed conditions on Broome's FACA membership.

#### **CASE STUDY: GEOFFREY BROOME**

On January 6th 2000, XX followed up with Lincolnshire CFA and Scunthorpe United FC to see if they had any information about Broome's current activities. This letter does not appear to have been prompted by any specific information coming to the FA. It may simply have been an attempt by the FA to monitor how its disciplinary mechanisms were working. A similar letter was sent to MC, at the same time. Lincolnshire CFA informed the FA that Broome was involved with a grassroots team, CGB Humbertherm FC. Scunthorpe United informed the FA that the Club was “not aware of Mr Broome's current activities, he is not associated with the club in any way”.

XX also wrote to Broome himself and asked him to:

“[C]onfirm to me each and every involvement with football you may have at the moment. If you have any contact with a club, please could you provide me with a letter from the relevant organisation so as to confirm that you are complying with the



decision previously notified to you.”

In response to this correspondence, Broome sought to appeal against his suspension by FACA. The FA asked the NSPCC for advice about this, and was told by the NSPCC that Broome was “an unsuitable person to coach children”. His appeal was rejected by the FA.

Around the same time, the FA received a letter from a Member of Parliament who had been contacted by XA, the person who had initially written to the FA about Broome. The MP said that she had received “quite disturbing letters” from her constituent about cases of child abuse, and “how FA coaches are allegedly not using their identification cards”. XX responded to the MP on March 22nd 2000, assuring her that the FA “treats child protection issues very seriously”. He asked her to provide further details of the allegations that had been made. It was explained that the FA had received correspondence previously from the constituent and had responded to him.

Lincolnshire CFA informed XX on July 18th 2000 that it had received a request from Broome that he take over as secretary of CGB Humbertherm FC, and asked XX for his advice. The County FA informed XX that Broome also intended to take the training and coaching sessions for the under 14s section of the Club. XX spoke to the County FA and said that Broome should not have any involvement with the Club as it would breach the conditions of his FACA membership. The County FA advised the Club that Broome was not permitted to act as Secretary to the Club, or to be involved in the coaching of young players at the Club.

Subsequently, Lincolnshire CFA provided correspondence from the Club to XX. The Club stated that it was aware that Broome was seeking to challenge the suspension, and hoped the situation would be resolved. In the meantime, it had been agreed that Broome would not hold any position of authority within the Club either as secretary or manager of any team or teams. He would also not be present at or undertake any coaching. He would be permitted “to contribute his expertise by way of a consultancy role to the managers of the various age groups. This will be accountable to a small management committee.”

On November 27th 2000, XX wrote to the FA’s Executive Sub-Committee to say that Broome had been ordered not to have any contact with children through football in relation to his membership of FACA. “It now seems that he has continued to flout that. In these circumstances, it is recommended that Broome be removed from all forms of football pending a hearing.”

On the following day, November 28th 2000, XX wrote to AT, an official of Lincolnshire CFA. XX explained that Broome was “able to participate in football where this involves only over 18s. You will appreciate that this requires careful monitoring due to the fact that minors may play in ‘senior’ football”. XX said that he was “aware of allegations that Mr Broome has in fact continued to operate in football which obviously involves minors. If so, this is particularly serious.” AT was asked to let XX know if this was the case and all relevant details. AT contacted CGB Humbertherm to see if Broome continued to be

involved with minors. He explained that Broome was allowed to participate in football with players over the age of 18 years, but this needed “careful monitoring due to the fact that minors may play in senior football”. The FA was informed that Broome was “not acting as Secretary of the Club nor coaching and training young players”.

Broome was subsequently suspended from all footballing activity involving under 18s. On March 23rd 2001, QX wrote to Broome to remind him of his suspension. QX explained that he had learned that it was Broome’s intention “to accompany a group of children to an organised tournament in Blackpool this weekend”. Broome was told that that would be a clear breach of his suspension, and that if he ignored the suspension disciplinary action would follow.

A parent at the Club had also written to the FA to express concerns about the Blackpool trip. Tony Pickerin wrote to the parent to explain that the FA had been in contact with the tournament organiser and with Broome, and that more generally the FA policed its child protection policy by informing all affiliated bodies including County Football Associations of any disciplinary decisions relating to their particular area. Pickerin explained, “It is then the responsibility of the County FA to ensure that no person under suspension participates in any football activities by that suspension.” These were sensible measures to assist in policing suspension decisions. Of course, they would not prevent suspended individuals from moving area and seeking to involve themselves in football in another county.

Broome sought to appeal against his suspension. He provided a psychologist’s report. The FA forwarded this to the NSPCC for its consideration. The NSPCC carried out a risk assessment and, in May 2001, the NSPCC informed the FA that its view was that it had “not been demonstrated that Mr Broome poses no risk to children”. Broome’s case was considered again by the Disciplinary Commission of the FA in 2002. The Commission decided to uphold Broome’s suspension.

Further correspondence about Broome was sent to the FA in July 2004. It was suggested that Broome was still involved in football. In September 2004, WK wrote a file note about Broome. (WK worked for the NSPCC, and provided consultancy services to the FA in relation to its case management.) WK stated that until recently there had been no evidence that Broome had been involving himself with local football clubs. More recently there had been stronger evidence that Broome had been involved: Broome’s handwriting appeared on players’ registration forms. (Lincolnshire CFA had written to the FA about this, as had one of the correspondents.) WK proposed that contact be made with the Club (CGB Humbertherm) and Broome himself. He also suggested writing to one of the people who had been corresponding with the FA about Broome to reassure him that the matter was being taken seriously. It does not appear as though further correspondence was sent out. In early 2005, the County FA contacted the FA to find out what was going on.

The matter was looked into by QX, whose advice was that the FA should probably carry out a review of the suspension by a suitable Commission, which could then lead to the issuance of appropriate guidance. There is no further information from the FA archives as to whether a review was carried out.

**5.** This section should appear in chapter 8 of the Report on the FA under the County FA section for Lincolnshire CFA: see paragraph 8.5.34.

**LINCOLNSHIRE CFA**

A further case that involved Lincolnshire CFA was that of Geoffrey Broome. Circumstances concerning Broome, and the CFA's interactions with and about him, are referred to elsewhere in the Report.