



# Minutes

<b>Title of meeting</b>	PINS Board Meeting		
<b>Date</b>	16 March	<b>Time</b>	12:30
<b>Venue</b>	Brunel, Temple Quay House, Bristol		
<b>Chair</b>	Sara Weller ( <b>SW</b> ) – Chairman		
<b>Present</b>	Jayne Erskine ( <b>JE</b> ) – Non Executive Director David Holt ( <b>DH</b> ) – Non Executive Director Susan Johnson ( <b>SJ</b> ) – Non Executive Director (dial in) Sarah Richards ( <b>SR</b> ) – Chief Executive Tony Thickett ( <b>TT</b> ) – Director, Wales Ben Linscott ( <b>BL</b> ) – Director of Inspectors Navees Rahman ( <b>NR</b> ) – Director of Corporate Services		
<b>In attendance</b>	Simon Gallagher ( <b>SG</b> ) – Director of Planning, DCLG Mark Warren ( <b>MW</b> ) – Finance Manager (item 5 & 11) Mark Southgate ( <b>MS</b> ) – Director, Major Casework (items 5-6) Phil Hammond ( <b>PH</b> ) – Director, Volume Casework (items 5-6) Tim Guy ( <b>TG</b> ), Director of Transformation (item 7, 11 & 12)		
<b>Apology</b>	Jo Esson ( <b>JE</b> s), Head of Governance and Strategic Support (Item 7) Natasha Perrett ( <b>NP</b> ) – Board Secretary		

## Part One

### Schedule of Actions – 13 October 2016

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
11.	<del>Peter Sloman</del> Navees Rahman	Review the MTFP to consider the audience of the document and ensure it is not seen simply as a “cost-cutting” exercise. It needs to reflect a focus on the end-goal of inspectors and decisions. The document should demonstrate the importance of delivering the right service at an affordable cost.	6.5	<b>10 July</b> – for 18 July PINS Board.
13.	<del>Peter Sloman</del> Navees Rahman	Take forward next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to look at how big the productivity phase 1 “BAU” cost reduction might be</li> <li>• consider, in phases 2 and 3, what else might get us to a sustainable footing (changes to</li> </ul>	8.6	<b>Complete</b> – item 7 on the May PINS Board agenda.

		the service proposition, fees) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify the metric that shows we are becoming more productive</li> <li>• identify what needs to be in the budget.</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--

### Part One

#### Schedule of Actions – 10 November 2016

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
5.	Simone Wilding	Bring a deep dive on band 3 work across the organisation including an overlay of the third runway and organisation capacity of inspectors and support teams.	7.11	<b>Complete</b> – item 6 on the May PINS Board agenda.

### Part One

#### Schedule of Actions – 8 December 2016

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
6.	Rich Addison & Pete Sloman	The dashboard to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add the target and trajectory to the casework performance graphs.</li> </ul>	5.3, 5.4, 5.7 & 5.8	<b>Closed</b> – action superseded by the PINS Board dashboard.

### Part One

#### Schedule of Actions – 19 January 2017

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
4.	Tony Thickett	Bring findings of research into difficult customers to the February or April CQPSC meeting. TT to confirm to NP.	4.2	<b>Complete</b> – action update paper reviewed at the April CQPSC.
7.	Mark Southgate	Include the outcomes of the White Paper and impact on Band 3 work in the Workforce Planning review for March Board. As part of the Workforce Planning and Band 3 update to include what demand looks like over the next 12-24 months (e.g. Local Plans, South East Runway etc) and our ability to react.	6.4 & 7.6	<b>Complete</b> – item 6 on the May PINS Board agenda.

### Part One

#### Schedule of Actions – 16 February 2017

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
1.	Katie Hartwright	Provide feedback to DCLG/SG on exit interviews. Also circulate to the People Committee (updated 16 March).	3.3	<b>Complete</b>

6.	Mark Southgate transferred to Sarah Richards	MS to take forward the principles and next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• measures to reflect the experience of all customers</li> <li>• measures should reflect end-to-end experience (and start point, receipt to decision or valid to decision)</li> <li>• they should be simple to understand</li> <li>• they should be comparable, so customers in different casework areas can more easily compare relative performance</li> <li>• a backstop should be added to the measures with a maximum time to deliver</li> <li>• when customers reach the maximum time to deliver, make sure we have clear action points.</li> </ul>	6.10	Item 5 on the May PINS Board agenda.
7.	Mark Southgate transferred to Sarah Richards	Think about unintended consequences of change measures and be clear about what happens for a customer when we are not able to fulfil the commitment.	6.12	Item 5 on the May PINS Board agenda.

### Part One

#### Schedule of Actions – 16 March 2017

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
1.	Mark Warren	Ensure the narrative in the dashboard highlights the key issues arising from the full MI pack before removing the full pack.	5.4	<b>Complete</b>
2.	Tim Guy	Bring the new CACI business case to the May Board meeting, alongside the Strategic Outline Business Case.	5.7	<b>Update</b> - The CACI Business Case is now called IWPS (Inspector Workforce Planning and Scheduling). The Business Case will go to the ISC in June. TG advise which Board meeting will receive the Business case.
3.	Navees Rahman	Explore at the next CQPSC what/ how PINS acquire the IT	5.8	<b>Complete</b> – workshop at the April CQPSC.

		and delivery skills needed.		
4.	Katie Hartwright	Ensure the HR controls audit includes compliance with return to work interviews.	5.9	<b>Complete</b>
5.	Mark Warren	Check the heading of the % variance from revised budget (net operating costs) bar chart on page 20.	5.10	<b>Complete</b> – the heading was amended.
6.	Mark Southgate and Phil Hammond	Provide an update on actions being taken on Hearing and Inquiry performance ahead of the May PINS Board.	5.12	<b>Complete</b> – update captured in item 6 on the May PINS Board agenda.
7.	Duane Oakes	Investigate the source of the increase shown in the last 2 quarters of data.	6.6	<b>Complete</b> - Further investigations have not found an obvious reason for the increase of HAS appeals. This area is monitored quarterly and the Board will be advised if anything becomes obvious.
8.	Duane Oakes	Add a line on the monthly chart to show expected weeks “valid receipt to decision” with a target of 16 weeks.	6.8	<b>Complete</b> - This graph will not be produced again in the format presented previously.
9.	Navees Rahman	Monitor 167 inspector output days and raise this number through the productivity work.	6.9	<b>Complete</b> – item 7 on the May PINS Board agenda.
10.	Mark Southgate and Phil Hammond	Review band 3 FTE forecast to address the perceived risks with ‘higher level skills’ supply and demand.	6.14	<b>Complete</b> – item 6 on the May PINS Board agenda.
11.	Sara Weller/ Natasha Perrett	Circulate the NED interaction paper to the Board for comment.	8.1	<b>Complete</b>

## Minutes

1.0	<p><b>Welcome and Declaration of Interests</b></p> <p>1.1 The Chair welcomed staff observers Helen Jones and Joanne Millard. Susan Johnson joined the Board via telephone.</p> <p>1.2 The Chair called for Declarations of Interest (DoI) of which there were none .</p>
2.0	<p><b>Minutes of 16 February Board Meeting – Part one</b></p> <p>2.1 No further comments were received on the February PINS Board minutes.</p> <p>2.2 The following updates were received on the actions:</p>

- 11 of October meeting – Medium Term Financial Plan NR said the new income forecast will be included and an update for savings in 17/18. Sequencing is still being worked through and will not incorporate the Strategic Outline Business Case. Steps to become financially sustainable and productivity measures will be included.
- 6 of December meeting – Target date is for the May Board meeting.
- 7 of January meeting – moved to May Board not closed.
- 1 of February meeting – Katie Hartwright to circulate feedback on exit interviews to the People Committee as well as DCLG (action updated).
- 6 of February meeting – The Board agreed the target proposals should come to the April CQPSC meeting (action updated).

**Agreed:**

2a) The minutes reflect a true and accurate record of the February meeting.

3.0

**Committee Chair updates, meeting of 16 March**

**a) Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (ARAC)**

3.1 DH reported the key messages from the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (ARAC):

- Whistleblowing policy – the Committee focussed on the issues around the low number of people speaking up, despite the process in place. The Committee asked Katie Hartwright and the team to think about the relationship of Whistleblowing to the wider diversity and inclusion agenda, including bullying and the words we used (eg in describing the contact point for escalation).
- Emerging Policy Risk Register – the Committee discussed risk appetite and process and how the Committee can gain confidence in the process ahead of submitting to the Board for endorsement.
- Government Internal Audit Agency (GIAA) – the Committee reviewed the 2017/18 audit plan. The Committee asked SR and team to give thought to the appropriate use of GIAA to form part of the assurance framework and Annual Governance Statement. Also think about other areas of assurance for greater resilience for forming an opinion on complex areas.

**b) Customer, Quality and Professional Standards Committee (CQPSC) (meeting of 16 February)**

3.2 Following the Chair's update at the February PINS Board meeting, no further comments were received on the CQPSC minutes.

**Agreed:**

	3a) To note the update from the Committee Chair.
4.0	<p><b>PINS update</b></p> <p>4.1 The Annual Training Event (ATE) for inspectors took place 7-9 March in Cardiff. The event went well, lots of positive feedback has been received about the organisation of the event and the venue. The session with Directors was well received. It was agreed the exercises, training sessions and open forums were very engaging.</p> <p>4.2 There was some discussion around more reference to Wales needed in the material and papers. SR agreed and said changes in Wales around the appeals process would be useful for the Board to hear and understand. There is learning for the system in England. SR suggested a possible session outside of the Board on cross border learning, we should ensure SG is also included.</p> <p>4.3 The Board focussed on the planner recruitment market and the limited number of planners. This challenge is affecting both public and private sectors. Steve Quartermain (SQ), Chief Planner at DCLG is taking forward how we can encourage qualified planners to take up roles in Government. SR has also been in discussion with SQ and the RTPI.</p> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <p>4a) To note the PINS CEO's update.</p>
5.0	<p><b>Monitoring performance</b></p> <p>5.1 As discussed at the January PINS Board, the seasonal slowdown of volume planning appeals which affects the average time to decided can be seen in the dashboard. Overall performance is expected to be back on track in February/future months.</p> <p>5.2 We are currently reporting an overspend position against the budget. Following a detailed assessment of the risks and forecasting performance and reporting, at the end of the financial year we will be underspent against the budget. The Board agreed with SG that the quality of financial forecasting needed further focus, in line with the recommendations from NR.</p> <p>5.3 From the new financial year, the MI pack will cease to exist. The Board will continue to receive the dashboard, and in line with the bi-monthly Board timetable the Board will have a deep dive session on a specific subject matter. The proposals for the deep dives are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May – Hearings and Inquiries performance (confirmed)</li> <li>• July – Enforcement performance</li> <li>• September – Financial position</li> </ul> <p>5.4 The Board agreed the narrative captured in the dashboard needs to reflect the issues which are in the full MI pack before the full pack is removed. Currently these are not connected. When reviewing the full MI pack, SW suggested MW and the team consider what questions the Board</p>

might have. For example, we are further underspent than previously reported to the Board; this is not captured in the dashboard.

5.5 The Board discussed project performance and the number of amber/ red projects, in particular the CACI project and IT related projects. SJ raised concern around the performance of the projects when also coupled with the need to appoint a Head of IT. NR agreed IT input into the projects is key. There is currently an interim Head of IT in place, as the recent recruitment round for this post was not successful. NR is learning the lessons around why we were not able to find a suitable candidate. On the CACI project, the seed funding from DCLG is intended to help scope the project. We are in the process of procuring a project manager. The Transformation Programme Board (TPB) is managing and monitoring the risks to this project.

5.6 JE raised concern around how we change the delivery culture in the organisation. We need to make sure we do not over promise what can be delivered.

5.7 As the CACI project is business critical, SG asked once we have appointed a project manager will this bring the project back on track. NR said we need to secure the future funding for the project. The funding was not secured for 2016/17. SW asked why the Board and SG were not made aware of the lack of funding for this project. SR explained there had been an assumption made funding had been secured. This project was already underway when SR arrived. It was not clear; the Spending Review settlement did not include funding for projects from the Change agenda in the Spending Review period. MW explained further, that the scoping requirement of the project changed following review at the TPB. The original project scope was for a like for like replacement without fully considering business requirements for the future. Following the review the ask was bigger. SW asked for the CACI business case to come to the May PINS Board meeting, alongside the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) to help the Board understand the history.

5.8 The Board discussed the need for an IT strategy to ensure systems and packages are not developed in silos, as IT experience of IT integration at a strategic level is very important. NR explained we are looking for a head of IT that has digital service and frontline delivery experience. SG explained DCLG has appointed a new Head of IT. SG suggested TG and NR engage with the new person as they will be able to support. The Board agreed to review what/ how PINS acquire the IT and delivery skills needed at the next CQPSC meeting.

5.9 The Board reviewed the average working days lost chart (page 27), DH asked who has ownership of the absence issue. SR explained HR owns the statistical information and process, the issue is reviewed and owned by Management Team. JE explained this is also tracked through the People Committee. The Board agreed the next HR controls audit should include compliance with return to work interviews.

5.10 DH queried the % variance from revised budget (net operating costs) heading (pg 20). DH said he would expect to see a different profile by month against the revised budget. MW agreed to check this is correct.

5.11 The Board discussed and agreed that a broader conversation around forecasting across the organisation needs to take place to look at how accurately we forecast the workload and the budget. NR said the Management Team are looking at what is happening in the housing market, economy and reviewing the impact on appeal intake. Duane Oakes (DO) is also doing more with the intelligence he is receiving from DCLG colleagues. SG said DO should look at the Analysis Modelling in Government document. NR explained PWC are doing some work on forecasting in National Infrastructure (NI) and suggested the lessons learnt from this work come to ARAC.

5.12 SJ queried hearings and inquiries performance which appears to be falling further behind target. Whilst there will be a deep dive session at the May Board, the Board agreed it would be helpful to have an update on the actions being taken before the May Board.

**Agreed:**

5a) MW to ensure the narrative in the dashboard highlights the key issues arising from the full MI pack before removing the full pack.

5b) TG to bring the new CACI business case to the May Board meeting, alongside the Strategic Outline Business Case.

5c) NR to explore at the next CQPSC what/ how PINS acquire the IT and delivery skills needed.

5d) KH to ensure the HR controls audit includes compliance with return to work interviews.

5e) MW to check the heading for the bar chart on page 20.

5f) MS & PH to provide an update on the actions being taken to improve hearings and inquiries performance ahead of the May Board.

6.0

**Inspector Resource Requirements**

6.1 MS invited the Board to review the estimated resource requirement and risks, for assurance that the estimated requirement and consequent budget provides PINS with sufficient inspector resource to meet casework targets.

6.2 MS highlighted that, although there is now less reliance on non-salaried inspectors (NSIs), we are offering NSIs less casework. This causes a risk around attrition. In volume casework the last 2 quarters have shown an uplift in the number of applications in the systems which have been refused. We have not seen an increase in the number of appeals submitted.

6.3 SW asked the Board to consider if we can now gain confidence the lower level of inspectors is underpinned by a good evidence base, for the Board to sign off the budget as we believe we have the resource to manage the work and supply of resourcing.



6.4 DH asked what events could cause our forecasts to be wrong. DH sought assurance that the team have thought ahead and looked at the variations.

6.5 The Board agreed forecasting accuracy for volume casework historically has been good, as we have sight of refusal rates and the propensity to appeal. We are less accurate on the rest of the work.

6.6 MS explained we have seen a shift in Householder Appeals (HAS) casework, possibly as people are moving less and extending more. The data for the last 2 quarters is showing a potential trend which is being monitored closely. The Board agreed to record the risk to HAS casework and investigate the source of the increase shown in the last 2 quarters of data.

6.7 The Board discussed "start to decision" targets, currently set at 80% in 14 weeks. DH asked what the team's expectations are against the customer target of "valid receipt to decision" for 17/18. MS suggested this would be 15-16 weeks. SW asked to be sure that 16 weeks is deliverable. PH said we can expect to achieve this as the start to decision target performance; waiting times to start cases will continue to reduce as additional inspectors join PCO.

6.8 SW said it would be helpful to add a line on the monthly chart to show expected weeks "valid receipt to decision" with a target of 16 weeks.

6.9 The Board referred to the 167 average casework days output from inspectors, assumed within the workforce planning model, which varies across bands. SW asked if there is potential raise this number through the productivity work. NR agreed to monitor inspector output days.

6.10 SW asked the Board if there is confidence in the inspector retirements and reduction in hours data. SW felt attrition of 30 inspectors is a good robust figure if trends remain the same as last year. BL explained he receives information informally on reductions to hours and potential retirements. DO said data from the latest recruitment rounds shows approximately 1 in 10 new trainees has left. MS said reductions to hours and turnover is being monitored closely. This is clearly a risk to workforce plans.

6.11 MS said we need to be prepared as more National Infrastructure projects come back on stream. We need to get the uplift in the higher bands right as we could receive more NI work.

6.12 SG referred to Local Plan examinations and asked if we are confident we receive enough notice that plans will be submitted. MS explained the band 3/ high level skills and demand paper coming to the Board in May will cover this topic. MS explained on NI and Local Plan work, the relevant teams receive notice of intention to submit.

	<p>6.13 SW said the Board had gained confidence in the inspector resource requirement, particularly around volume casework. The remaining risk for the Board is the higher specialist skilled work which is harder to resource. The Board understands there is more volatility in this work.</p> <p>6.14 In May the Board will review Hearings and Inquiries performance recovery, and band 3 FTE forecast to address the perceived risks with 'higher level skills' supply and demand.</p> <p>6.15 NR thanked DO and the rest of the team for their hard work in the forecasting space and for preparing for the Board.</p> <p><b><u>Agreed:</u></b>  6a) DO to investigate the source of the increase shown in the last 2 quarters of data.  6b) DO to add a line on the monthly chart to show expected weeks "valid receipt to decision" with a target of 16 weeks.  6c) NR to monitor 167 inspector output days and raise this number through the productivity work.  6d) MS – May Board will review band 3 FTE forecast to address the perceived risks with 'higher level skills' supply and demand.</p>
7.0	<p><b>Review of revised Strategic Risk Register (to align with the Strategic Plan)</b></p> <p>7.1 The Board agreed to review the strategic risk register as part of item 10 on the agenda.</p> <p><b><u>Agreed:</u></b>  7a) To review the strategic risk register as part of item 10 on the agenda.</p>
8.0	<p><b>How NEDs can play their part in PINS' cultural transformation</b></p> <p>8.1 The Board agreed to review and circulate comments on this paper outside of the Board meeting.</p> <p><b><u>Agreed:</u></b>  8a) SW to circulate the NED interaction paper to the Board for comment.</p>
9.0	<p><b>Minutes of 16 February 2017 PINS Board (part two) – OFFICIAL SENSITIVE</b></p>
10.0	<p><b>Delivering the Strategic Plan, priorities and funding for 2017/18 – OFFICIAL SENSITIVE</b></p>
11.0	<p><b>Forward Planner</b></p> <p>11.1 The Board agreed the following forward planner updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May Board - business plan and band 3 inspector resource</li> <li>• July Board - commercial model and flexibility and business cases.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Agreed:</u></b>  <b>11a) The March PINS Board agenda.</b></p>

Next meeting: 18 May 2017, 10.30pm – 1.30pm