



# Minutes

<b>Title of meeting</b>	PINS Board Meeting		
<b>Date</b>	18 May	<b>Time</b>	10:00
<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>	Chris Dagnan ( <b>CD</b> ) – Process Improvement Manager (item 5) Mark Southgate ( <b>MS</b> ) – Director, Major Casework (item 6) Phil Hammond ( <b>PH</b> ) – Director, Volume Casework (item 6) Simone Wilding ( <b>SWi</b> ) – Head of Major Casework Management (item 6) Duane Oakes ( <b>DO</b> ) – Senior Statistics Manager (items 6 & 7) Natasha Perrett ( <b>NP</b> ) – Board Secretary Simon Gallagher ( <b>SG</b> ) – Director of Planning, DCLG		
<b>Apology</b>			

## Part One

### Schedule of Actions – 13 October 2016

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
11.	Peter Sloman 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>Complete -</b> item 6a on the July agenda

## Part One

### Schedule of Actions – 16 February 2017

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
6.	Mark Southgate transferred to Sarah Richards	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-</li> </ul>	6.10	<b>6<sup>th</sup> September 2017</b> – Following discussion at the May PINS Board, the Board agreed

		<p>to-end experience (and start point, receipt to decision or valid to decision)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>		to revisit the targets proposal in September.
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	<b>6<sup>th</sup> September 2017</b> – Following discussion at the May PINS Board, the Board agreed to revisit the targets proposal in September.

### Part One

#### Schedule of Actions – 16 March 2017

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
2.	Tim Guy	Bring the new CACI business case to the May Board meeting, alongside the Strategic Outline Business Case.	5.7	<b>Complete</b> – TG circulated the IWPS (Inspector Workforce Planning and Scheduling) business case outside of the Board to comment.

### Part One

#### Schedule of Actions – 18 May 2017

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
1.	Navees Rahman	Review, discuss and agree the deep dive session for the next PINS Board meeting.	3.5	<b>Complete</b> – the Board will have a follow up session on Hearings and Inquiries performance at the July Board (item 5b).
2.	<b>Ben Linscott,</b> Mark Southgate and Phil Hammond	Bring to the September/ November Board an assessment of the impact of the new Government and the impact on the pipeline of work to PINS and inspector resource.	4.3 & 8.1	<b>6<sup>th</sup> September 2017</b> – for the September Board.
3.	Jo Esson	Circulate the new Code of Conduct to the Board.	4.8	<b>Complete</b>

4.	Mark Warren	Add to the PINS performance metrics table, the number of appeals in each casework type.	4.9	<b>Complete</b>
5.	Navees Rahman	Check if our messaging to the organisation around the recent cyber-attack clearly explained the importance of not responding to phishing e-mails.	4.11	<b>Complete</b> – article published on the intranet on 15 <sup>th</sup> May which made clear to staff not to open suspicious emails or links regardless of the source.
6.	Sarah Richards	Publish performance ranges to the Appeal Casework Portal and to make clear what we will do if an appeal is submitted with missing documents.	5.6	<b>Ahead of 6<sup>th</sup> September 2017</b> – for September Board meeting.
7.	Tim Guy & Sarah Richards	Consider how the transformation programme will improve performance to reduce the average time over the lifetime of its delivery.	5.14	<b>Ahead of 6<sup>th</sup> September 2017</b> – for September Board meeting.
8.	Mark Southgate	Produce a trajectory for hearing and inquiry casework to show how we are improving performance, the current set of plans to show the gaps and how we close them – July Board.	6.4	<b>Complete</b> - item 5b on the July agenda.
9.	Natasha Perrett	Add to the People Committee forward planner - Workforce plan and how we manage career paths and temporary promotions.	6.6	<b>Complete</b> – added to the September agenda.
10.	Mark Southgate	Scenario plan how we resource beyond the need at band 3 and discuss with the department the cost of bring over resourced in the band 3. Bring a review of band 3 resource requirements to the September Board.	6.7 & 6.9	<b>6<sup>th</sup> September 2017</b> – for September Board meeting.
11.	Navees Rahman	July Board will focus on the unit cost model.	7.6 & 7.8	<b>Complete</b> - item 6b on the July agenda
12.	Tim Guy	July Board will have an update on the latest transformation business case	7.8	<b>Complete</b> - item 7 on the July agenda
13.	Ben Linscott	Circulate the slide pack presented to the Board.	8.2	<b>Complete</b>

14.	Natasha Perrett	<p>Forward Planner:</p> <p><b><u>July</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of the new Board dashboard.</li> <li>• In depth review of the productivity model including Strategic Outline Case input and business unit costs.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>September</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manifesto update and impact on workforce planning, particularly band 3 resource.</li> <li>• Resource for the complex workloads.</li> <li>• Revisit performance target proposals.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>November</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfer of best practice between England and Wales.</li> <li>• Strategic Plan session and considering the numbers for the following year.</li> </ul>	2.1, 3.4, 5.16, 8.3, 9.2	<b>Complete</b>
-----	-----------------	--	--------------------------	-----------------

### Minutes

1.0	<p><b>Welcome and Declaration of Interests</b></p> <p>1.1 The Chair welcomed the Board. Apologies were received from Simon Gallagher.</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 March Board Meeting – Part one &amp; Part two</b></p> <p>2.1 No further amendments were received for the March minutes.</p> <p>2.2 The Board referred to section 4.2 of the March minutes, and asked for cross border learning between England and Wales to be transferred to the forward planner for the November Board meeting.</p> <p>2.3 The following updates were received on the actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action 11 (October minutes) – Medium Term Financial Plan – will also include the outcomes of the Transformation Programme.</li> <li>• Action 1 (February minutes) - NP to forward KH update to the Board.</li> <li>• Action 2 (March minutes) – The Board agreed the IWPS (Inspector Workforce Planning and Scheduling) business case should be shared by email ahead of the June Investment Sub-Committee meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Agreed:</u></b></p> <p>2a) Both sets of minutes reflect a true and accurate record of the March</p>

	<p>meeting. 2b) NP to add transfer of best practice between England and Wales to the November agenda.</p>
3.0	<p><b>Committee minutes</b></p> <p><b>a) Customer, Quality and Professional Standards Committee - 20 April</b></p> <p>3.1 No further comments were received on the CQPSC minutes.</p> <p><b>b) People Committee – 20 April</b></p> <p>3.2 No further comments were received on the People Committee minutes.</p> <p><b>c) Audit and Risk Assurance Committee – 16 March</b></p> <p>3.3 No further comments were received on the ARAC minutes.</p> <p>3.4 The Board discussed the allocation of risks and data required for the PINS Board and Committee dashboards. It was agreed the Board should take the opportunity to explore the new dashboard at the July meeting.</p> <p>3.5 DH asked the Management Team to be cautious about removing the detail from the dashboard. NR explained the detail and accountability will come through the deep dive session. NR agreed to review and consult on what topic would come to the July Board for a deep dive.</p> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <p>3a) NP to add a review of the new Board dashboard to the forward planner for July.</p> <p>3b) NR to review, discuss and agree the deep dive session with the appropriate Committee Chair.</p>
4.0	<p><b>PINS update</b></p> <p><u>CEO Report</u></p> <p>4.1 SR reported a shift in our approach to conducting stakeholder engagement, whereby the annual Stakeholder Engagement event was replaced this year by a series of more personalised interactions to reach customers not recently involved through the stakeholder conference.</p> <p>4.2 BL, PH and Stuart Campbell (SC) met with planning agents based in the Midlands. 12 agents attended the session. The discussions validated previous findings on what our customers want from PINS. More meetings have been arranged and there will also be a session with the RTPI. BL and SC are also aiming to extend this work to meet with LPAs.</p> <p>4.3 SJ asked if we have considered the impact of the newly appointed Metro Mayors. SR agreed that this raised questions about responsibilities for devolved Strategic Planning. SW suggested the Board has an item in</p>

September or November on the New Government and the impact on the pipeline of work to PINS and inspector resource. Band 3 level work is most likely to be affected by the elections and we may need to further resource-up at this level.

4.4 SR and Stuart Reid met with the Open Spaces Society. SR said this was a very interesting and helpful meeting.

4.5 TT and the Sub-Group Leaders have been supporting Welsh Government with development management workshops. TT will be running 2 seminars at the RTPI and will be reaching out to planning agents.

4.6 The 4 Chiefs meeting took place in Cardiff. This was a valuable opportunity to share experiences and learn from each other.

4.7 The stakeholder event will go ahead in Wales this year and will be held in September. TT will confirm arrangements.

4.8 SW asked for the new Code of Conduct to be circulated to the Board.

#### Dashboard

4.9 The Board discussed the March dashboard. SW asked for an addition to the PINS performance metrics table to set out the number of appeals in each casework type.

4.10 JE noted the reduction in average working days lost. BL and NR have found the monthly directorate attendance management deep dive meetings reassuring. However, whilst it is clear managers are applying policies and understand the importance of their role in attendance management, there are some inconsistencies in approach.

4.11 The recent cyber-attack was discussed. NR explained whilst we were not affected we used it as learning for our business continuity and disaster recovery processes. As it had not been made clear in the media that the issue had been caused by a phishing email, NR agreed to check if our messaging to the organisation had reinforced the importance of not responding to such e-mails.

4.12 DH referred to the underspend for 16/17 reported in the dashboard and asked how the Finance Team will manage this going forward to avoid similar underspends next year. NR explained the actions the team are taking to avoid this recurring. NR suggested as part of the finance deep dive, ARAC review the quarter 1 process to allow for challenge from the Non-Executive Directors (NEDs).

#### **Agreed:**

4a) To note the PINS CEO's update.

4b) MS, PH and BL to bring to the September/ November Board an

	<p>assessment of the impact of the new Government and the impact on the pipeline of work to PINS and inspector resource.</p> <p>4c) JEs to circulate the new Code of Conduct to the Board.</p> <p>4d) MW to add to the PINS performance metrics table the number of appeals in each casework type.</p> <p>4e) NR to check if our messaging to the organisation around the recent cyber-attack clearly explained the importance of not responding to phishing e-mails.</p>
5.0	<p><b>Performance targets</b></p> <p>5.1 SR reported that she had set up a small group to review the external ministerial targets for the organisation. All targets were in scope and discussed by the group; the presentation to the Board focussed on core appeal targets.</p> <p>5.2 SR set out the 4 recommendations to the PINS Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The basis of the ministerial targets change to better reflect the customer journey (e.g. Receipt to Decision or Valid to Decision rather than Start to Decision).</li> <li>2. We measure, use and publish average performance together with an expected predictable range of performance. E.g. you can currently expect a decision in between 12 to 18 weeks from receiving you appeal; our current average is 14 weeks.</li> <li>3. The average and predictable performance range measures are set-up when the principle has been agreed.</li> <li>4. Review all external targets, in parallel with internal metrics.</li> </ol> <p>5.3 Over 60 external targets were identified. Some of these external targets are set in service level agreements with other organisations, some were set by PINS and some are historical which have been set out in ministerial letters. Only 4 of the targets are classed as statutory targets.</p> <p>5.4 Members of the group spoke to people in PINS to learn the lessons of changing targets and the impact changes had previously had on our performance. The group also reviewed customer insight to find out what is important to our customers. It was clear our customers require certainty of timescales and clear communication between submission of an appeal and receiving a start letter.</p> <p>5.5 SR talked the Board through a test page of the information and timescales we would like to publish on the Appeals Casework Portal. The page will include information about our performance and provide the minimum and maximum number of weeks it will take to receive a decision and our average time between the ranges. We would also tell our customers how long we are taking to validate appeals, which will give clarity about what happens once the appeal is received. We will also highlight the problems invalid appeals cause us and how customers can make sure they are not part of the 25% of appeals submitted with missing documents.</p>

5.6 DH suggested we explain in the missing documents section what we will do if we find documents are missing. SR agreed this information should be added to give clarity to our customers.

5.7 The Board discussed the varying history of PINS performance throughout the years, and the analysis that had been carried out to identify what had caused performance issues in the past.

5.8 SR explained where changes to targets and different processes were introduced such as householder appeals (HAS) and bespoke inquiries, when plotting the inspector requirement for that time it was clear we did not have the adequate resource required. We are now much better at understanding our workforce requirements.

5.9 Our intention is to give customers predictable certainty over our performance. DH suggested we explain to customers the longest they will have to wait for a decision, but not necessarily include the shortest time and provide the average time. Internally we should find out why some cases are processed quicker than others and share the learning to continue to bring down average times.

5.10 SR explained the proposals to the Board:

1. Work with DCLG to agree the principles of measures that better reflect the customer journey.
2. Move towards measuring our performance and publishing it as average and upper and lower predictable performance range, to provide certainty that matters to customers.
3. Once the above principles have been agreed with DCLG, we set up average and predictable performance range measures.
4. Review all our external (and internal) targets and change them as they come to be seen as less and less useful.

5.11 SW asked if we understand the cost of delivery for example in 14 weeks versus 16 weeks, versus 18 weeks? We need to understand the cost with the current resource, so we can engage with DCLG on how changes to the permitted maximum number of weeks would affect the savings we can achieve? NR explained we are developing our financial modelling with the aspiration of being able to cost the different levels of service.

5.12 SJ suggested we future proof the targets in light of fees. In the conversation with DCLG we need to consider the impact of fees, as this will change the customer expectation. SR said we need to set the principles to measure and publish, with the understanding these are subject to change as a result of external factors.

5.13 The Board agreed that the principles to set a range and average timescales would be better for our customers. These would be published online. In preparing for the conversation about targets with the Minister, SW



suggested SR make clear the work we are doing to give clarity to our customers on performance.

5.14 The Board recognised the work of the transformation programme will either help to reduce the maximum amount of time it takes to receive a decision or reduce the average times. SW suggested SR and the team review performance yearly with a view to continuously reducing the average time over the life of the Transformation Plan, which would then be one of the TP's most visible benefits.

5.15 SR proposed to bring the performance measures back to the Board in September following discussions with Simon Gallagher and Melanie Dawes. SR would also like to share the proposals with our stakeholders to gather their views and feedback.

5.16 SW said the changes were very welcome as they will provide certainty and transparency to our customers and will also give them clarity on how they play their part in the process by submitting complete appeals.

**Agreed:**

5a) SR and team to publish performance ranges to the Appeal Casework Portal and to make clear what we will do if an appeal is submitted with missing documents.

5b) SR/NR to develop an approach to scope the cost of different levels of service e.g. the cost of delivering in 14 weeks versus 16 weeks, versus 18 weeks.

5c) SR/TG to consider how the transformation programme will improve performance to reduce the average time over the lifetime of its delivery.

5d) NP to add further discussion on performance targets to the September agenda.

6.0

**Band 3 casework and resource requirements**

6.1 MS explained Inquiries performance is improving as we start to offer earlier event dates, however we are not getting the same traction with planning Hearings. Analysis is showing there is a variation between event to decision times.

6.2 The Board discussed the varying factors which can affect the number of days required to hold a Hearing and Inquiry and to then produce the decision. BL explained a number of things could affect the decision timeliness such as the complexity of the case, the number of parties and witnesses involved, availability of necessary information and having inspectors that are new to the type of casework.

6.3 MS explained the use of run charts to look at the range and issues, and how better management information is helping the team to understand the problems.

6.4 SW referred to the work the team took forward to reduce the backlog of

cases in volume casework and how well documenting a trajectory had worked to allow the Board to see progress in reducing case numbers. SW asked MS to produce a trajectory for Hearing and Inquiry casework to show how current plans are expected to improve performance and how any outstanding gap can then be closed via additional actions. This will enable the Board to have a conversation about how we get to the 14 week target. DH said the Board needs to be able to understand the pace of delivery and where we will be in up to 12 months.

6.5 PH said we need to better understand the Hearing process to establish where the improvements can be made. Improvements to the process in line with Planning Casework Operations processing will help to improve performance.

6.6 JE asked BL to think about how proposals will impact on resourcing eg will inspectors continue to be willing to work above grade? BL noted the importance of distinguishing level 3 casework and band 3 resource requirements, to consider the incentives, issues and implications. The Board agreed this is linked to the workforce plan and how we manage career paths and temporary promotions. This item should be transferred to the People Committee.

6.7 On behalf of Simon Gallagher (SG), SW raised the significant reputational risk in complex casework and the risk of not being adequately resourced. SG had suggested the team undertake some scenario planning, centred around the current "high" workload forecast, looking at how we resource beyond this forecast of need. SR/NR should talk to the department about the cost of being over resourced in the band 3 and how this might be covered (eg by taking additional risk on lower profile casework).

6.8 NR explained the need to become better at forecasting, more flexible with our resource and deploy staff quicker.

6.9 The Board agreed to review band 3 resource requirements again in September to allow for the outcomes of the Election and to give the team an opportunity to discuss resourcing approaches with SG. The Board would also receive a view of the pipeline of work.

**Agreed:**

6a) MS to produce a trajectory for hearing and inquiry casework to show how we are improving performance, the current set of plans to show the gaps and how we close them – July Board.

6b) NP to add to the People Committee forward planner - Workforce plan and how we manage career paths and temporary promotions.

6c) MS to scenario plan how we resource beyond the need at band 3 and discuss with the department the cost of being over resourced in the band 3. Bring a review of band 3 resource requirements to the September Board.

7.0	<p><b>Productivity measures</b></p> <p>7.1 NR explained we are at the beginning of our journey on productivity measures. SW agreed and said the approval of Strategic Outline case will contribute to the journey through the business cases. All of these will impact on our targets and productivity.</p> <p>7.2 When thinking about inspector working days, DH said it is important we make sure inspectors focus on the areas that use their skills and expertise. BL explained PH and BL are embedding this into the process workstream. We need to give people control to improve productivity.</p> <p>7.3 JE asked if we have taken account of feedback received for inspectors who have worked above grade. JE said it would be good to see if inspectors conducting work above band are as productive as those permanently appointed to the higher band.</p> <p>7.4 Work is underway to gather data on inspector performance, expectations, case types and location to create comparability amongst individuals. This would help learning around individual variances in similar cases and share learning and improve processes.</p> <p>7.5 NR's proposed productivity measures split the organisation into 3 cohorts, inspector, casework support and shared services. The Board expressed more comfort with the proposed measures for casework and shared services, but less so with inspector productivity. SW said the decision per inspector is not a good measure as we are not just interested in the volume of cases processed, but we need quality measures too (eg complexity of casework, quality of decisions made).</p> <p>7.6 SW asked for the inspector productivity measure to be added to the dashboard and the Board will track this every month to look for improvement. The Board needs to know where we are at the moment, where we need to be going forward and how we are going to get there. SR said we have a clear strategy about how we are going to deal with the introduction of fees. The unit costs model will drive the negotiations around what we will charge. The Board agreed to revisit the unit costs model in July.</p> <p>7.7 Management Team will be discussing an overall "system" measure and breaking this down into smaller pieces of work, to include individual measures for aspects of productivity performance. NR will take this forward with BL as part of the expectations work. When the item comes back to the Board, we will need to be clear about which areas we will push forward.</p> <p>7.8 In light of several board items discussed at this meeting, it was agreed productivity would come back to the July Board and focus on the unit cost model, and there would be an update on the latest transformation business case.</p>
-----	---

	<p><b>Agreed:</b> 7a) The July Board will focus on the unit cost model and an update on the latest transformation business case.</p>
8.0	<p><b>Manifesto analysis</b></p> <p>8.1 BL gave an overview of the emerging manifestos from each of the major political parties and their potential impact on PINS. BL explained there will also be other important policy work which will have an impact on PINS. SW agreed a detailed look at the manifesto of the elected party and its impact on workforce planning should come back to the Board in September.</p> <p>8.2 SR said it will be really important to meet quickly with the Minister to get a sense of the need from PINS. BL agreed to circulate the slide pack presented to the Board.</p> <p><b>Agreed:</b> 8a) BL and MS to bring a manifesto update and impact on workforce planning to the Board in September. 8b) BL to circulate the slide pack presented to the Board.</p>
9.0	<p><b>Review of meeting &amp; AOB:</b></p> <p><u>Equal Pay Audit update</u></p> <p>9.1 Work on the Equal Pay audit has started. There will be a presentation at the People Committee in June.</p> <p><u>Forward planner</u></p> <p>9.2 The Board agreed the following forward planner updates:</p> <p><u>July</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of the new dashboard</li> <li>• further review of productivity focussing on unit costs</li> <li>• Update on Transformation/Strategic Outline business case.</li> </ul> <p><u>September</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manifesto update and impact on workforce planning, particularly band 3 resource.</li> <li>• Resource for the complex workloads.</li> <li>• Revisit performance target proposals.</li> </ul> <p><u>November</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Plan session and considering the numbers for the following year.</li> </ul> <p>9.3 The 2017-18 Business Plan will be circulated outside of Board.</p> <p><b>Agreed:</b> 9a) The PINS Board forward planner.</p>

Next meeting: 18 July 2017, 1.00pm – 4.00pm