

MANAGEMENT BOARD POLICY MEETING (MBPOM) MINUTES – 26.9.13

TIME : 10.00pm **LOCATION** : G18

ATTENDEES : Peter Mason, Chair, Chief Executive (PEM, CE)
Richard Sanders, Director, Regulation (RS)
Sarah Glasspool, Director, Finance (SMG)
Robert Gunn, Director, Programmes & Estate (RG)
Jo Symons, Director, Change & Development (JS)
Richard Frewin, Director, Enforcement (RF)
Paul Dixon, Director, Certification Services (PRD)
Tania Raynor, Secretariat for Meeting (TR)

*Please note actions appear in **BLUE***

1. Apologies for Absence/Substitutions: PRD (away on business), Dave Barrett (DB), Head of HR for Item 3 (out of office), JS (joining late due to telecom)

2. Matters/Actions arising from Minutes of last meeting (25.7.2013): The minutes were approved and the actions identified at the 27.6.13 Management Board (MB) Policy Meeting had all been discharged bar the following:

- There was an action on IMcD to draft a paper on the implications and lessons from the gas main/electrical cable incident of 12.9.12. This was still awaited. Recommendations that had emerged at the Audit Committee had been followed up and investigation work was still underway. A full implications paper had yet to be drafted. **Produce paper for next month's MBPOM (RG/IMcD, October)**

3. Performance Development System (PDS)

SMG presented this item on behalf of DB. Most of the contents of the paper had been discussed previously. The important points to note were as follows:

1. The three box markings/guided distribution figures
 2. The role of the Civil Service Competency Framework
 3. The "what" and "how"
 4. The Mid Year Review
- The frequency of meetings was discussed and SMG clarified that the formal process was intended to be streamlined and required formal review at mid and end of year only. However, as a matter of good practice, staff were encouraged to hold more informal and frequent reviews meetings
 - At least 6 competencies would be agreed by Line Managers and jobholders using the generic and specialist frameworks
 - Queries were raised as to how consistently the policy would be applied across Whitehall. However, it was considered too early to comment upon that, except to note that all Government Departments would follow the same guided distribution principles, e.g. Category 1, Category 2, or Category 3. NMO would continue to share with BIS its experiences and contribute to the implementing of the new policy via Dave Barrett
 - Whether staff in Category 1 received a performance bonus was subject to wider pay negotiations (as taken forward by core BIS).
 - In agreeing the PDS, NMO had opted to follow the centralised guidance provided by the CSEP team, but chose not to adopt the higher Category 3 centiles adopted by BIS. PEM confirmed that at this time there were no financial consequences attached to Category 3
 - The draft Performance Management Report Form was approved by the Management Board, who agreed there was less repetition in the new format. However, there was feeling that whilst it was good to lose the complexity of the old form, some good details were captured from the more lengthy form i.e. 'What Happened'. RS explained that he had added the boxes from the new form to the old one, and this led to repetition and an overly lengthy form which he then summarised, resulting in a form that was very similar to the new proposed BIS form. Thus, it was agreed the Agency should run with the new form for a year, gauge staff feedback, and review progress next year.
 - **The following amendments were to be communicated to DB to incorporate accordingly (SMG, October):**

- *Job description to be added to the form*
- *Remove duplication – ‘Period of Report’ is requested twice on the front page*
- *‘Signature of Line Manager’ to be replaced by ‘Reporting Officer’*
- *‘Signature of Counter Signing Officer’ to be replaced by ‘Counter Signing Officer’*
- *‘Signature of Employee’ to be replaced by ‘Job Holder’*

4. **Comprehensive Disposal Policy**

Resulting from the recent investigation, and subsequent XDIAS audit report of Enforcement disposal, CS had been asked to develop a Comprehensive Disposal Policy, which he had produced after researching other Government policies.

Circulate Management Board letter from XDIAS highlighting the weak control systems and the need to modernise our disposal mechanisms (SMG, Sept/Oct)

- This paper sought high level strategic agreement having duly considered the risks of disposal, disposal obligations for data and electronic goods, socially acceptable disposal, benefits and costs. The policy should be established by end October (as recommended in the audit) and should contain a set of principles outlined within this paper, to form a relatively simple document setting direction to minimise waste, maximise value and minimise risk - aligning with drivers from Whitehall. The policy would then be integrated in the overarching Quality Manual where it was easily accessible.
- The MB carefully studied the risk model and discarded the Risk Averse level 4 approach. It was also recognised that lots of organisations would be involved for ‘Risk Accepting’ levels 1 and 2
- RG commented that every effort should be made for each individual item to seek out other uses. Perhaps it would be possible to establish a scheme to pass items to a third party for charity. RF confirmed that an arrangement with a charitable organisation to distribute goods to charity would fall under ‘Risk Aware’ level 3 **Explore this idea further with UKSBS (RF/CS, October)**
- Due consideration should be given to reputational risk and resource cost of disposal at level 3. It was noted that NMO already sell on weights directly via the website – **Liase further with UKSBS (RF/CS, October)**
- CS commented that he had already spoken to a number of organisations i.e. HMRC and the Queen’s Warehouse, where they run auctions and events with funds raised being returned to the Treasury. They all seemed quite open to assisting other Agencies

Management Board agreed that level 3 was the most desirable approach, although there were some attractive features to level 2 which should be explored further. However, whilst NMO should remain open to the possibility of some of the disposal routes in level 2, the Agency should also be mindful of its pitfalls and the resource required.

Write overarching policy for Quality Manual (RF/CS, October)

5. **New Business, Energy Efficiency Directive Enforcement & Administration (DECC)**

CS presented this paper concerning a potential new area of business for the Agency i.e. enforcement of the energy labelling of buildings:

- DECC were considering the implementation of the Energy Savings Opportunity Scheme (ESOS) and would require 2 services; (a) an authority to enforce obligations on larger organisations, and (b) a scheme administrator to deliver the infrastructure to ensure the accessibility of qualified quality audits/auditors
- NMO had earned a good reputation in value for money Enforcement and Policy development activities on behalf of various Secretaries of State. The Agency had a now slightly more formal relationship with DECC, who had asked NMO for outline proposals as a potential supplier. CS pointed out the recent consultation document named NMO and the Environment Agency (EA) as potential lead suppliers. However, CS would expect the EA to win the bid. PEM said that historically, the EA had not been enthusiastic for product inspection, but was unlikely to have as problem with premises inspection.
- Although the sums involved were not large, the decision on whether to put forward a bid should go to the Management Board and Steering Board. RF said a quick decision could be required (by end December) as the enforcement part of the scheme would need to commence in 2015
- PEM emphasised the need to be risk aware. NMO needed to consider all financial implications and the risk of moving so far from core competencies that strategic direction, reputation or expertise were compromised

- RS mentioned that David Moorhouse (DM), Business Team Manager, Utilities, had also been approached, via email, to do something for DECC regarding the Energy Efficiency Directive
Discuss with DM and update Management Board on this issue (RS, October)

6. **All Staff Intranet Satisfaction Survey**

James Devenish (JD) discussed some of the issues that had emerged from the survey results:

- Generally feedback was positive and there did indeed appear to be demand for the intranet. However, staff felt that there was perhaps a little too much information on the intranet and that a simpler version would be beneficial
- There were concerns with delays to updates
- There appeared to be some conflict between the Intranet and TRIM (NMO's official EDRM), and rather too much duplication
- There were requests for one page devoted to document location
- SMG confirmed to RF that stripping the intranet down to the barest minimum would affect the capital charges, but would not make any resource savings

The MB agreed with JD's recommendations as set out in the 'Brief Summary and Analysis to Accompany the All Staff Intranet Survey Report'. It was agreed that the Comms team should consult regularly with the Quality Manager to avoid duplication, and that the intranet should be streamlined/de-cluttered and maintained in good condition to as to ensure it would pass BSI audits. Documents being accessed needed to be on TRIM, and thus the intranet needed to have TRIM links with the most recent document versions

Circulate email to all staff to thank them for their responses, and to impart staff opinion and what changes the MB had endorsed (SMG/JD, October)

7. **Proposals for IT Refresh**

DS presented this item and brought along three examples of ultra-portable laptops. DS said that the MB needed to take into consideration the IT message being communicated from BIS (portability, mobility, and being prepared for change) when choosing between the 5 options outlined in the paper:

1. Do nothing - This option had already been rejected due to the increased costs in repair and time.
2. Provide identical desktop hardware throughout NMO with a shared laptop pool. Whilst this option would make modest savings in hardware and support costs, it would not meet NMO's need for mobile IT solutions and the number of users who would insist upon ongoing laptop provision
3. Provide identical ultra mobile laptops throughout and getting rid of all desktop computers completely
4. Provide varying hardware throughout NMO i.e. desktop, laptop or tablet
5. A mixture of laptops only

PEM said that the Board had the choice of imposing complete uniformity, deciding who has what, or giving the staff the option to choose.

SMG explained that VAT needed to be added to ALL the figures provided in the document, and therefore this would not change the cost merits therein.

DS expressed a preference for option 3, which he felt was more economically viable and would enable cheaper, more efficient support overhead of only servicing one model of PC. DS would need to fully examine the security implications of this option. The MB agreed and endorsed this option. However, it was agreed that more research was needed regarding the BIS mass purchase deal with DELL. It was noted that although DELL laptops had a longer battery life and a clean docking system, they were bigger/less portable than others available on the market.

- **Investigate the possibility of purchasing DELL laptops on the back of the BIS arrangement (SMG/DS, October)**
- **Further research DELL to assist in making the decision re size/style/brand of laptop (SMG/DS, October)**

8. **AOB**

- The MB agreed that there would be nil-returns this year for the Honours list

- RS asked about the status of the 13 Management actions identified in the XDIAS cross Departmental Management Letter. PEM confirmed that actions continued to be tracked via the Audit Committee and that there was an intention to communicate more to the Management Board
- RF circulated to all an Enforcement Team structure organisation chart for information
- SMG mentioned that Sue Baker in G1 would not be organising the Staff Christmas Lunch this year. **Ask staff for volunteers to organise the Christmas lunch & let SMG know if anyone expressed an interest (Directors, September)**
- PEM reminded the MB that Amanda Brooks (the new Director of Innovation) would be visiting on Tuesday 1st October and that short (10-15min) presentations were required from all Directors
- RG had received an email from BIS regarding 'BIS Outreach' visits/open days designed to enhance BIS' relationships with and understanding of the organisations and businesses affected by its policies, in order to gain customer insight and to improve the Department. The MB agreed it would be beneficial to demonstrate who NMO were and what it did to those not involved in its activities. However, it was recognised that an open day might be difficult to organise in terms of resource, and timing should be at the Agency's discretion
Clarify if this request was meant for NMO or NPL. If, indeed, it was meant for NMO, explain that although we probably did not really qualify as an Executive Agency as 'outreach', the Agency would be happy to organise a visit (RG, September)

9. **Date of next meeting:** *Thursday 31st October 2013*