



Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency

Minutes

Title of meeting	Corporate Executive Team formal monthly meeting
Date	04 October 2016
Time	09.00 – 13.00
Venue	RT-410, BPR
Chair	Ian Hudson
Attendees	CET

CET Attendees

Ian Hudson	Chief Executive (Chair)
Richard Humphreys	Deputy Director of Finance
Siu Ping Lam	Director of Licensing
Rachel Bosworth	Director of Communications
Vanessa Birchall-Scott	Director of Human Resources
Janet Valentine	Director of the Clinical Practice Research Datalink
Christian Schneider	Director of the National Institute for Biological Standards & Control
[Redacted]	deputising for Director of Devices
Anne Paskin	DH Legal Services
Jonathan Mogford	Director of Policy
Gerald Heddell	Director of Inspection, Enforcement and Standards
John Quinn	Director of Information Management
June Raine	Director of Vigilance and Risk Management of Medicines

Additional attendees

Andy Gregory (Policy) for item 4: Post-EU referendum - update and discussion
[Names redacted under section 40 of the FOIA (personal data)]

1. Apologies and Announcements

1.1 Apologies were received from John Wilkinson.

2. Draft minutes of the 31 August Corporate Executive Team meeting (CET/16/254) including table of actions and final minutes of the 9 August Corporate Executive Team (CET/16/255)

2.1 The draft minutes were agreed. The CET reviewed and provided updates on the table of actions. The final minutes of the 9 August meeting were noted.

3. Draft minutes of the Agency Board meeting of 12 September (CET/16/256)

3.1 The draft minutes of the Board meeting of 12 September were noted – of both the public and closed Board sessions.

STRATEGY

4. Post EU Referendum – update and discussion (CET/16/257)

4.1 [Redacted under section 35 of the FOIA (Formulation of government policy)]

5. Academic relationships (CET/16/258)

5.1 Christian Schneider presented an update paper on progress in building and maintaining academic relationships across the Agency. Academic relationships are an agreed and important strategic component of the Agency's current and future work. Academic links have to be maintained after their formal establishment, and measuring success may be more challenging for less obvious items beyond scientific collaborations. Currently, MoUs exist with Imperial and UCL; however continuous active engagement is needed to maintain these relationships. Colleagues have been seconded between UCL and NIBSC demonstrating this good relationship. The possibility of a research retreat where scientists discuss and are challenged on their work could be explored across the Agency. Measures of success were considered; such as measuring scientific papers, conferences abstracts and teaching courses. However there are some deliverables which are more difficult to measure, for example how to measure access to expertise and learning, early knowledge of potential topics with future impact on medicines, devices and blood components, which can be fed into the Agency's horizon scanning activities, or improved understanding of regulatory science on the side of the academic collaborator.

5.2 Creation of an "Agency Academic Collaboration Register" was suggested. There are some local maps of academic relationships in NIBSC, which could be widened with some resource. Less obvious stakeholders could also be included, such as research councils. An academic relationships ambassador position was also suggested.

5.3 The CET commented that there are a lot of benefits to gain from exploring academic relationships; and there is support for resource for this. Academic relationships could have an international scope, not just national. The CET commented that needs were different in different parts of the Agency, and that links needed to be established locally, by all parts of the Agency. Any mapping exercise would need to capture examples of concrete collaboration. CPRD has undertaken joint PhD-ships and training which would be useful to have officially documented in the map. Any mapping exercise should be linked with horizon scanning exercises. Workforce planning should include resources from other organisations to focus on. Ireland has created a virtual regulatory science network which involves academia, regulators, industry and government agencies – this should be reviewed.

5.4 The CET recognised the outward facing links across all operating teams are very important, particularly on the leadership side. Much outward facing work has to be done at team level. An informal network across the operating teams could be considered rather than any formal cross Agency team; however an exercise documenting all academic relationships across the agency could be a challenge to maintain up to date; therefore local academic relationships champions should be focussed on; CET also thought it important to think about potential links with regulatory science. There may also be Board members who would be interested in being involved.

Action: To consider establishing an informal network of individuals across teams who have knowledge of academic relationships and could share such information as and when required.

6. Horizon scanning (CET/16/259)

6.1 [Redacted under section 35 of the FOIA (Formulation of government policy)]

7. Digital Platforms – phase 2 business case (CET/16/261)

7.1 [Redacted under section 35 of the FOIA (Formulation of government policy)] John Quinn presented the phase 2 business case for digital platforms. This has been approved by IMGB. The business case proposes the next phase to add Master Data Management (MDM) capabilities to the core digital platform to address the data challenges, and forms the main component of delivery of the data stream of the Operational Transformation Programme. MDM is the 2nd phase of implementing the Digital Platforms that replace the Agency's legacy technologies that provide the building blocks for the services which need replacing. The CET sought clarity of the budgetary situation in. IMD and Finance will work to review this. The CET were assured that the cost elements of this business case relate to developing the minimum viable product recognising this is a difficult approach to take in relation to services. The business case should demonstrate how this is reported back to the Agency Board. The CET endorsed the business case, with the provision that for future cases, Brexit and budgetary implications will be explicitly addressed in the paper rather than left for discussion.

8. Accommodation programme - Needs & Vision project update (CET/16/262)

8.1 Rachel Bosworth presented a paper updating CET on the work of the Needs and Vision group, including drafts of the needs and vision statements for comment in advance of staff engagement in October. Over the last 4 months there has been much staff engagement including workshops, interviews with CET and surveys, which have resulted in over 2000 comments from staff; a space utilisation survey has also been ongoing at MHRA and at NIBSC over the last two weeks. The group has also visited the new Cabinet Office accommodation and other external organisations, and a member of staff also attended the national Way We Work conference. There has been feedback supporting the place of work to be pleasant, fit for purpose, inspiring, a good experience for visitors and customers, and with good supporting technology. This should be reflected by the new technology coming in through the digital programme.

8.2 In relation to the vision statement, there have been various themes emerging. These are in relation to culture and the role of managers enabling staff to work in different ways; not just about accommodation but about organisational culture with greater integration and need to use this for organisational culture change. The group have also undertaken a postcode analysis to understand the potential for greater use of the South Mimms site; there is also a lot which can be learnt from the TW3 (The Way We Work) smarter working initiative; a CET MAD session will be held to devote thought and consideration to this.

8.3 The CET gave support for consideration of greater use of the NIBSC site should the analysis indicate this would be useful, however agreed that the name should not be changed from NIBSC as it is an established brand. The booking system for meeting rooms needs to be carefully considered, including cancellation of a room booking after 15 minutes if not confirmed. It was agreed to reinstate this at BPR and ensure appropriate communication of this. The CET agreed that the need for a conference suite is understandable but needs to be considered in relation to a trade-off for space. Perhaps off-site space should be considered

for certain events. The CET noted that the customer experience for visitors seems to have been lost in BPR due to the layout of meeting rooms, and it would be good to improve this.

8.4 The CET commented that work could be done to develop a conducive training environment, as part of the career pathways work. The meeting rooms proposed will be flexible to enable changeable sizes and layouts. The space utilisation survey results will inform discussion on the number of desks required.

8.5 In relation to the vision statement, the CET agreed that the Needs and Vision group are on the right track; however the statements need some refinement. It is clear that increased travel time is the biggest issue for staff. The work of the Needs and Vision group will be picked up by the Acquire and Exit group and the Relocation Programme Board. How to allocate space will need to be considered for the November CET paper and recommendations should be made. Assumptions should also be included in the November paper.

Action: Report back in November CET, with consideration given to appropriate allocation of space.

9. Patient Safety & Vigilance Strategy (CET/16/263)

9.1 [Redacted under section 35 of the FOIA (Formulation of government policy)]

GOVERNANCE & DELIVERY

10. Finance and Procurement Report (CET/16/264)

10.1 Richard Humphreys presented the finance and procurement report for the year to 31st August. The regulator variance is £0.4m ahead of budget; £1.1m ahead for NIBSC and £0.1m ahead for CPRD. Overall, after five months, the Agency has a retained surplus of £4.6m, £2.9m above budget. The 2016-17 deferred income is at £18m, however £8.5m of this is applications made this year. This time last year this was £0.5m higher and £2m higher in 2014-15. This could be the first sign of a fall off of PL income. There have been no new approvals at IMGB so no significant changes in the IM portfolio schedule. The CET commented that it may be too early to tell if the Agency is experiencing a drop in application as we expect to see a lot of new molecules coming in at the end of 2016-17.

11. Managers conference & SLG (CET/16/268)

11.1 [Name redacted under section 40 of the FOIA (personal data)] presented a proposal for the programme for the next Senior Leadership Group (SLG) meeting and the next managers' conference. The next SLG meeting is on 2 December, and the suggested agenda involves the 3 main challenges facing the Agency in relation to Brexit, Operational Transformation and Accommodation. The theme proposed is developing a high performance and productivity culture across the Organisation and content should be influenced by the People Survey results. The feedback from the managers' conference was also included, which was overall positive, with >80% feedback that the conference was useful. The Connaught Rooms have been booked for the next managers' conference and themes have been proposed.

11.2 The CET commented that the main theme for the SLG could focus more on the key challenges for the Agency rather than the high performance and productivity culture. The high performance and productivity culture theme would also be relevant to the managers' conference not just the SLG. The themes will be agreed following the results from the

People Survey. The CET noted the feedback from the managers' conference; the topic of non-attendance at the managers' conference was discussed and it was noted that it would be useful to review which members of staff regularly do not attend the meetings rather than as a one-off as these staff members may have legitimate reasons such as other priorities meaning they were unable to attend. The CET supported the suggested names to explore for the managers conference and the themes. An update will be heard by CET in November.

Action: continue to develop programmes and explore speakers and topics; present update to CET in November 2016.

12. SCS in-year bonus (CET/16/269)

12.1 Vanessa Birchall-Scott presented a proposal for the introduction of an in-year performance assessment related bonus for SCS staff. The Civil Service scheme on offer provides for a new in-year, non-consolidated 'contribution award' scheme from 2016/17 enabling recognition of outstanding contribution for 10% of SCS staff, within the existing 3.3% cash limit for non-consolidated performance awards in future, but not for this year. In-year awards are to be worth no more than £5,000 per person. The paper proposed to use mid-year reviews as the tool to identify those who should receive a bonus.

12.2 The CET agreed to adopt the new scheme; up to a maximum of 10% of staff, with a bonus cap at £5000. It was agreed that awarding of this in-year bonus should not affect the end of year bonus and should not be used to reward those who already received a bonus for the 15/16 year. A moderation session will be held to agree final nominees, criteria will be either a particularly compelling recent piece of work or very good performance last year that is continuing but was not rewarded by a bonus already..

13. Flexitime (CET/16/270)

13.1 [Name redacted under section 40 of the FOIA (personal data)] presented a paper on the current cross-Agency use of flexitime; and highlighted some inconsistencies in application of the flexitime scheme across the agency with reference to G6 and G7 post staff. The inconsistency comes from lack of clarity in the guidance and historical uncertainty over the matter. The DH guidance states flexitime is open to all staff except SCS staff; however other guidance states it is only for full time members of staff from AO to SEO grade. A number of G6 and G7 staff have been identified who are currently operating under the flexitime scheme who technically are not eligible for the scheme. HR are in the process of creating a single flexitime policy. The recommendation was made to confirm that G6 and G7 staff are not eligible to access the scheme; however the individuals who are currently utilising the scheme would continue to have access as a historical past practice entitlement which would expire either when there was a need to review a change in service, or if the individual moved role.

13.2 The CET agreed to the proposition that flexitime should not be offered to new staff in G6 or G7 posts, subject to consultation; however noted that certain areas of the inspectorate system of staff management should be maintained. It was confirmed that this change in flexitime policy would only affect those specifically defined in the paper. The CET agreed the recommendation to maintain for current G6 and G7 who have flexitime arrangements.

Action: HR to consult on proposal that flexitime should not be offered to new staff in G6 or G7 posts.

14. Review of the Corporate Risk Register (CET/16/271)

14.1 Richard Humphreys presented the Agency's Corporate Risk Register (CRR), which was last seen by CET on 5 May and will be seen by the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (ARAC) in October.

14.2 The CET agreed the new or revised text proposed in risks 1, 2, 3-6, 712, 13, 14, 16 and 17. The main change is the update to include Brexit risks.

Action: F&P to update the CRR to reflect CET's comments and submit to ARAC for discussion for the October meeting

15. Bi-annual review of external fraud (regulatory) risk register (CET/16/272)

15.1 Richard Humphreys presented the Agency's external fraud (regulatory) risk register. There were no significant updates to VRMM and Licencing; the Devices risk register was slightly updated. There was a major change to the NIBSC risk register in relation to the fraudulent creation of medicines testing certificates. There were minor updates to the IE&S risk register and no updates to the finance risk register.

16. Agreement of team briefing notes (CET/16/273)

16.1 The items appropriate for circulating to staff as team briefing were agreed by the CET.

INFORMATION

17. NIBSC SMT update (CET/16/274)

17.1 The minutes from the NIBSC SMT update from October were noted. .

18. CPRD SMT partners minutes (CET/16/275)

18.1 The minutes from the CPRD SMT partners meeting were noted.

19. Updates from Cross-Agency teams

19.1 These updates were noted by the CET.

Draft minutes of the 20 September Regulatory Group meeting	CET/16/276
Information Management Governance Board (IMGB) – Sept (draft)	CET/16/277
Finance Sub Committee meeting	CET/16/278
Policy and Procedures Committee	CET/16/279
Equality and Diversity Group	CET/16/283

20. Agreement of 8 November 2016 CET agenda (CET/16/284)

20.1 The CET agreed reviewed and commented on the draft agenda for the 8 November CET meeting. It was agreed that a number of items had still to be confirmed; relevant directors would advise Directorate.

21. AOB

21.1 It was noted that staff should be encouraged to observe at future CET meetings.

