



50 years of the Ombudsman service

1967-2017

PHSO BOARD OPEN SESSION MEETING

1 February 2018

Minutes (Approved)

MINUTES OF PHSO BOARD OPEN SESSION MEETING

1 February 2018

CHAIR:

Rob Behrens CBE, Ombudsman

NON-EXECUTIVE MEMBERS:

Sir Alex Allan KCB

Elisabeth Davies

Michael King

Ruth Sawtell

Sir Jon Shortridge KCB

Dr Julia Tabreham

EXECUTIVE MEMBERS:

Amanda Campbell, Chief Executive

Alex Robertson, Executive Director of External Affairs and Insight

APOLOGIES:

Alan Graham MBE, Non-executive Member

Gill Kilpatrick, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Services

IN ATTENDANCE:

Karl Banister, Legal and Governance Director

Andy Dawson, Governance Officer (minutes)

Martyn Schofield, Head of Governance

Lyn Wibberley, Chief of Staff

James Hand, Head of Business Planning and Performance (Items 3 & 4)

Warren Seddon, Director of Insight and Public Affairs (Items 3 & 4)

1. Chair's Introduction and Welcome

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed Alex Allan and Dean Fathers to their first meeting as Members of the Board. Apologies for absence were noted from Alan Graham and Gill Kilpatrick.

2. Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 There were no declarations of interest related to any matters on the agenda.

3. Strategy 2018-2011

- 3.1 A revised draft Strategy for 2018-21 had been circulated to the Board.
- 3.2 Alex Robertson (Executive Director of External Affairs and Insight) explained that the Strategy and its accompanying Risk Appetite Statement had been revised to incorporate feedback provided by members at the previous Board on 14 December 2017. The changes to the Strategy were summarised at paragraph 3.4 of the Strategy cover paper. Changes to the Risk Appetite statement were summarised at paragraph 4.2. Alex Robertson said that he was now seeking formal Board approval of the Strategy and Risk Appetite Statement.
- 3.3 Dean Fathers said that he supported both the Strategy, which was excellent, and the Risk Appetite Statement.
- 3.4 Michael King said that the Strategy was excellent. He approved of all of the language used, and wished to thank the Executive members for their positive engagement with the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman whilst developing the Strategy.
- 3.5 Jon Shortridge said that he fully supported the Strategy. The revised draft was excellent and fully reflected previous Board discussions. He said that he had some detailed comments on presentation which he would share later in the meeting.
- 3.6 Alex Allan said that the Risk Appetite Statement text relating to Strategic Objective 1 needed clarification, in that it said that our appetite was minimalist, whereas developing new approaches to complaint resolution might require a more innovative approach. James Hand said that the authors had considered splitting this into two separate objectives, 1A and 1B. Amanda Campbell said that the intention had been to make it clear that independence and impartiality could not be compromised, and that a minimalist approach was therefore appropriate. Rob Behrens said that we could be innovative in our approach without compromising impartiality.
- 3.7 Ruth Sawtell said that she welcomed the Strategy and particularly the Risk Appetite Statement. She agreed that we must be cautious in our approach to Strategic Objective 1.

Our Vision and Our Values

- 3.8 Julia Tabreham said that the language used in respect of complainants was inconsistent, varying between complainants and ‘those using our service’. Amanda Campbell said that, under transparency, the intention was to be open and honest with all people who used our service, not all of whom were complainants.
- 3.9 Elisabeth Davis said that she was conscious that, whilst the values had changed quite significantly, they were still ‘traditional’. In her view it was important to respect the origins of the values, which had been developed in consultation with staff.
- 3.10 Rob Behrens commented that the values had been debated widely and at all levels but that he would welcome additional input to ensure that the Strategy was accessible.
- 3.11 Jon Shortridge asked whether our vision should include the aim to be effective. He also expressed concern that committing to transparency may not always be possible and therefore could not be absolute.
- 3.12 Ruth Sawtell said that the term ‘Our Ombudsman’ did not ring true. The Board agreed that this term should not be used.
- 3.13 Rob Behrens said that it was important to strike the right balance between transparency and maintaining confidentiality, and that we needed to look at that further. On the use of the word ‘effective’, of course we needed to be effective.
- 3.14 Dean Fathers asked whether the change of the Secretary of State for Health’s job title (to include Social Care) had any implications for PHSO that would impact on the Strategy. Warren Seddon said that this was primarily a rebranding exercise for the Department of Health, and that there were no significant changes in the organisation of healthcare delivery that would impact on our remit. Dean Fathers said that his understanding was that some areas were integrating care systems and that the boundary between healthcare and social care will become increasingly blurred. We should therefore be aware of potential impacts in future. Michael King said that in his view the change in the Secretary of State’s job title was not significant.
- 3.15 Jon Shortridge expressed concern that there may be no progress on the movement to a Public Sector Ombudsman service in the lifetime of the Strategy, and that there may not be sufficient resources to prepare for implementation. His concern was about contextualisation and being ready. Warren Seddon said that it was unlikely that delivery would be an issue before 2021, as there would be a two-year implementation period. Rob Behrens said PHSO were still taking the lead, but that the final paragraph of ‘Setting the Scene’ would be amended to reflect Jon Shortridge’s point.

Strategic Objectives

- 3.16 Jon Shortridge said that Objective 1 should be refined further to recognise that the Target Operating Model (TOM) may require further development. He remained concerned about capacity and capability. Amanda Campbell said that in 2108/19 the aim was to implement TOM, and then to carry out a formal review at the end of the business year. Jon Shortridge felt that this was more appropriate to the Business Plan. Amanda Campbell said that as the Board had agreed TOM, it was now a strategic issue.
- 3.17 Jon Shortridge said that Objective 2 was confusing in that it seemed to suggest that we are already publishing some casework. Rob Behrens said that we were publishing some casework, for example the Insight Report reflecting the Hart case, but that he wished to publish more. Warren Seddon said that we periodically published case summaries and special reports, and that reports of joint investigations with the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman were published as a matter of routine.
- 3.18 Jon Shortridge asked about the limits of working in partnership with other organisations as proposed in Objective 3. Did this extend to organisations such as Citizens' Advice Bureaus and the Patients' Organisation? Julia Tabreham said that Objective 3 did refer to working with advocacy groups, of which there were two types, specific and general, for which different approaches may be required. Rob Behrens said that we had had a good meeting with various advocacy groups and that we had agreed to make reference to them.
- 3.19 Ruth Sawtell said that she did not like the reference under Objective 2 to losing loved ones, which she felt was insensitive. Under Objective 3, we should say clearly that we are looking to improve complaint handling across the public sector, not just internally.
- 3.20 Dean Fathers said that he was concerned that there was a conflict between the emphasis on independence and impartiality and the expectation that we would empathise with complainants. Over-empathy was not impartial, but lack of empathy could suggest a lack of compassion. We needed to consider these risks. Rob Behrens said that balancing these factors was at the heart of what we were trying to do. James Hand said that we had tried to address this in the summary of Objective 1 on page 9, but that we would consider further.

Measuring progress

- 3.21 Alex Allan asked how it was proposed to measure value for money in respect of our work with wider public services, which appeared to be very difficult. Dean Fathers suggested that it may be helpful to ask the Care Quality Commission how they measured value for money.
- 3.22 The Board unanimously **agreed** to approve the Strategy and Risk Appetite Statement, subject to minor amendments arising from the discussion.

ACTION: Executive Director of External Affairs and Insight to revise and finalise the Strategy 2018-21 and Risk Appetite Statement to incorporate amendments arising from the Board discussion.

4. PHSO draft business plan and budget 2018/19

4.1 The draft Business Plan and draft Budget for 2018/19 had been circulated to the Board.

4.2 Amanda Campbell led the discussion, and explained that, at this stage, we were seeking Board input into the draft business plan and budget, and that the Board's final approval would be sought at the meeting on 22 March.

Business plan

4.3 Elisabeth Davies raised three concerns: that there was a risk around change fatigue (although this was reflected in the business plan); that the Strategy should make provision for demand forecasting; and that and that we should consider whether we have the right balance between in-house and external provision.

4.4 Ruth Sawtell said that she shared Elisabeth Davies' concern about stability of demand - the Board needed to see the evidence base for the assumption that demand was stable. She said that, on Information and Communications Technology it was difficult to predict what was needed but that in her experience ICT projects will generally cost more and take longer than planned. Finally she was concerned that so many deliverables were marked as requiring investment.

4.5 Dean Fathers said that he agreed that change fatigue represented a risk. He said that there was a further risk around competence, capability and culture, if old staff were training new staff. He was concerned that there was ambiguity about the impact of 'boundary changes' within new NHS structures. He reflected that the democratisation of patients and service users through information technology had created challenges that the NHS had struggled to cope with.

4.6 Jon Shortridge asked who the audience for the business plan were; as written it seemed to be outward-facing, whereas in his view it should be directed internally. He asked how certain we could be that the plan was deliverable given that we had overpromised in the past. There was a risk to the organisation if we failed to deliver.

4.7 Alex Allan said that increased transparency and openness could lead to an increase in demand. He said that he shared concerns about the number of deliverables requiring investment, and commented that in his view the ICT risk was currently Red.

- 4.8 Michael King said that the business plan was well-structured and clear. However the three-year view led to future uncertainty over funding and demand. He agreed with concerns over the level of ICT risk and asked whether this was a future risk or a current problem. He said that the deliverables recorded under Objective 3 needed to be more precise.
- 4.9 Julia Tabreham said that she agreed with all the concerns expressed so far. She commented that there was nothing in the business plan about ICT as a driver of change; this needed to be developed more. She also said that the complexity of complaints may change fundamentally, as had been the case in the NHS, and that we should plan carefully to mitigate increases in complexity.
- 4.10 Amanda Campbell said that, on the issue of demand forecasting, over the past two years, demand for our services had not increased, even with increases over the complexity of the healthcare system and the pressures on NHS funding. We had therefore planned for static demand. The strategy was to help providers improve complaint handling, which should in turn reduce demand. This was an area which would be monitored carefully.
- 4.11 Amanda Campbell agreed that the complexity of complaints was an important issue. It had been agreed to continue funding the complex casework team to handle more complex cases.
- 4.12 Amanda Campbell agreed that greater transparency, through the publication of more casework, could increase demand. Michael King said that this had not been the case when LGSCO began to publish all of their casework. There had been an institutional impact but no increase in demand.
- 4.13 Amanda Campbell acknowledged that the amount of investment required was a challenge, but that it was largely unavoidable. The publication of reports will require a new system. Alternative Dispute resolution was a wholly new area for PHSO, where there were a number of options available. Much of the investment, particularly on Objective 3 deliverables, would be towards the end of the period. It was also planned to develop internal capacity in some areas, rather than buying in external provision.
- 4.14 Amanda Campbell said that the greatest risk to delivery was ICT. The Head of ICT was looking at how far the systems –could be made fit for purpose. Recent changes had made it suitable for general working, but accessibility needed to be improved and was now a priority. The business plan outlined our approach to ensuring that our system met staff and business needs.
- 4.15 Amanda Campbell said that the concerns expressed over change fatigue were valid. It was a risk but also an opportunity. She said that we now had a formal process for change, and a developed Change Programme. This approach ensured resilience and bandwidth.
- 4.16 James Hand said that the Business Plan was published online, so had to be an outward-facing public document. Jon Shortridge said that his concern

was that it should not be written as a publicity piece, but should be written in a way that is meaningful to staff.

- 4.17 Alex Robertson said that in the past we had been too ambitious about change. We had moved to a position where we now planned and implemented change carefully, and management and leadership had been trained to deliver change effectively. It was important now that the business plan was delivered rather than changed.
- 4.18 Julia Tabreham said that she was pleased to see the plan in its embryonic form. She felt that there was a consensus over the contents of the plan.
- 4.19 Rob Behrens asked whether the issue of overpromising and under-delivering had been addressed. Alex Robertson said that he was confident that we could deliver what was in the plan, although it would be necessary to work differently. Strong leadership would be needed.
- 4.20 Rob Behrens asked whether there were any outstanding concerns over management and leadership. Amanda Campbell said that the senior leadership structure was currently being reviewed. Her intent was to have a smaller number of directors, with greater responsibility and fewer levels of decision-making. In the past the structure had developed organically with no clarity of organisation or function. We were investing in management and leadership training down to assistant director level.
- 4.21 Ruth Sawtell said that it was reassuring to have a commitment to deliver the plan and nothing else. She identified commitments under Objective 3 to improve public sector complaint handling as an area where we could over-promise. She suggested that this could be tapered, and made dependent on factors such as external resourcing. Rob Behrens said that there was flexibility in this commitment. The aim was to make a contribution to improvements in complaint handling by bodies in jurisdiction. Objective 3 was about working in partnership.
- 4.22 Rob Behrens said that the recent Hart case had brought home the point that we needed to be capable of understanding structural and clinical changes in the NHS. We needed specialist advice. This was an area where we needed to develop further in-house skills, but this would not happen immediately.
- 4.23 Alex Allan suggested that there should be some contingency planning to mitigate where demand rose higher than was forecast. Amanda Campbell said that we had discussed this previously. The main mitigation would be not to investigate certain cases. However the threshold for such a step was unclear and required further consideration. Rob Behrens commented that that might be a scenario where we might consider seeking additional funding.
- 4.24 Rob Behrens thanked the Board for their comments on the draft Business Plan and said that any further comments or concerns could be submitted to or discussed with Amanda Campbell and the Executive Directors.

ACTION: Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Services to revise the draft Business Plan to incorporate amendments arising from the Board discussion.

Budget 2018/19

- 4.25 Amanda Campbell said that the draft budget covered the three year period from 2018 to 2021. There were risks around the final year as the information available was not yet complete. However we can say with confidence that we had delivered, or will deliver, all savings that we said we would. It was likely that there would be a surplus of £146k in 2018/19. The headroom figure of £396k referred to in paragraph 5 was incorrect. For 2019/20 a deficit was projected of £600k, and for £2012/21 a deficit of £2m.
- 4.26 Dean Fathers asked whether, historically, we had utilised our contingency funding. Amanda Campbell replied that, in the past we had tended to run significant underspends. However this had been a year of massive change, with major redundancy costs. Additionally we had operated with significant numbers of temporary staff, and had had to defend several important legal challenges. Therefore we had spent most of our contingency.
- 4.27 Alex Allan noted that the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review was the key issue for our financial position in 2020/21, and that if we did succeed in securing improvements in complaints handling across NHS and government, this would save money elsewhere in the public sector. Rob Behrens added that, if the Public Sector Ombudsman reforms went ahead and the Ombudsman became the Complaints Standard Authority, that would strengthen our position on supporting complaint handling in bodies in jurisdiction. Amanda Campbell said that we were in discussions with NHS Resolutions about reducing the overall cost to the NHS from complaints, and about the possibility of a joint bid for funding.
- 4.28 Jon Shortridge urged a high degree of caution in our approach to Treasury for 2020/21, and suggested that we should develop a strategy for dealing with them. Rob Behrens said that we also needed a strategy for dealing with Parliament as they had a say in our funding. There was support in Parliament but needed to think about how best to utilise it.
- 4.29 The Board noted the updated financial outlook for 2018/19 to 2020/21.
- 4.30 The Board noted the process to present a finalised budget to the Board on 22 March. Amanda Campbell invited Board Members to submit any further comments to her.

ACTION: Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Services to revise the draft Budget to incorporate amendments arising from the Board discussion.

5. Review of Board Effectiveness

- 5.1 A report setting out the review approach and findings had been circulated to the Board.
- 5.2 Karl Banister (Legal and Governance Director) introduced the discussion and said that the Board's comments will be reflected back in a further report in March, which would incorporate the reviews of the Board's committees. He said that it was proposed that the next review, in 2019, would be carried out by an external provider.
- 5.3 Martyn Schofield (Head of Governance) made a presentation to the Board (Annex 1 to these minutes) setting out the rationale for the review and highlighting the areas for Board discussion, including strengths and areas for improvement in 2107 and now, the interface between executive and non-executive members, and changes sought by the Board by 2019.

Board strengths

- 5.4 Dean Fathers said that the Board had a well-developed Committee system. Elisabeth Davies agreed; there was a strong flow of information between the Committees and the Board. It would be interesting to see what came out of the Committees' effectiveness reviews.
- 5.5 Julia Tabreham reflected that the range of legacy issues currently faced by the organisation suggested that the Board had not been as strong previously as suggested by the slide setting out perceived strengths from the 2017 review. Alex Allen said that one of those strengths - Clarity of roles and responsibilities - was not borne out by some of the review comments.
- 5.6 Amanda Campbell said that the 2017 scores were taken from the Governance Statement and were a point-in-time assessment. She did not think that it was helpful to focus on the historical position.
- 5.7 Jon Shortridge said that there was a significant legacy issue in respect of the actions of the former Deputy Ombudsman. The current Executive Team were far more open.
- 5.8 Michael King said that, to be effective, the Board needed an atmosphere of trust, adult discussions and a sense of shared endeavour. He believed these were now emerging. Ruth Sawtell agreed, saying that she now saw transparency and honesty in relation to risk which had not been there previously.
- 5.9 Alex Robertson said that there had been significant changes since he arrived 18 months ago. Then, the quality of papers had been poor, the Executive members of the Board were not confident as individuals or collectively, and there was a lack of proper Board review and challenge. Elisabeth Davies agreed, saying that the quality of Board papers and discussions had improved. The Board was now more comfortable working at a strategic

level, rather than focussing on operations, which was a sign of increased confidence, and she believed that the level of assurance had improved. She said that the Board now felt able to take ownership of strategy, which was a genuine strength.

- 5.10 Karl Banister asked if improved papers, and discussing the right things at the right time, were strengths or areas where we had improved. Elisabeth Davies said that in her view this was a strength. It was important to acknowledge the journey that the Board had been on in the last year.
- 5.11 Julia Tabreham said that she was not sure that we had clarity of purpose in 2017. There was now a clear distinction between the Ombudsman and the Chief Executive that had not been there previously.

Areas for improvement

- 5.12 Amanda Campbell said that her recollection on arrival at PHSO was that there was very little interaction between non-executive directors and staff. This had changed to some extent, for example through some direct meetings and staff presentations to Board committees. However there was still a great deal more to be done. Rob Behrens agreed, saying that he wanted non-executive directors to be aware of the organisation and staff, and to be external champions.
- 5.13 Dean Fathers asked what the staff survey told us about staff attitudes. However the survey did not ask about staff attitudes to the Board. Martyn Schofield said that there had been a very positive response from staff involved in Board induction training. Ruth Sawtell said that inviting staff to attend the Board as observers seemed to work well and always produced positive feedback. She suggested observers should be expected to feed back to their teams. Alex Robertson suggested that staff who have led on work for the Board should be present at the Board when it was discussed.
- 5.14 Jon Shortridge said that when he was a member of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman Board the relationship with staff was very different as he had worked closely with managers at a two-day conference. He suggested that such an event could be helpful at PHSO.
- 5.15 Amanda Campbell said that she and the Executive Directors had discussed how the Board could engage with the leadership team. This group was currently too large, but as we develop there will be a group of similar size to the Board.
- 5.16 Dean Fathers said that current weaknesses included the lack of triangulated data, and a sound and robust succession planning process, where potential future leaders were brought to the Board. Amanda Campbell confirmed that there was no such plan at PHSO. Julia Tabreham said that the Board should enable the flow of new talent from areas where it was currently underrepresented.

- 5.17 Elisabeth Davies said that there had been good progress in bringing quality issues to the Board, and the Quality Committee had widened the focus of their interests beyond the Service Charter. However whilst the Board had delegated quality issues to the Quality Committee, it was important that the Board retained oversight.
- 5.18 Amanda Campbell said that Benchmarking remained an area of concern. How, as a unique organisation, did we know what good looks like or determine whether we are good? Dean Fathers said that there were several options for benchmarking; either through self-reflection, or independent review using either a consultancy or through peer review. The latter could be achieved at little cost on a quid pro quo basis. Michael King said that the Ombudsman Association were currently developing a peer review mechanism and were looking for pilots.
- 5.19 Rob Behrens commented that he perceived that there was still a degree of optimism bias, and a reluctance to discuss bad news.

Non-executive/executive member interface

- 5.20 Alex Allan said that the comments suggested some tension or conflict. Dean Fathers said that it was important to have assurance in the form of triangulated data. It would also be helpful for non-executives to have evidence of how the Board were perceived.
- 5.21 Alex Robertson said that in his view the relationship was evolving. Eighteen months ago Executives were reluctant to report bad news. This came from a lack of confidence. The position now was that Executives were focussed clearly on delivery. However the dynamic should be kept under review.
- 5.22 Elisabeth Davies said that, whilst the non-executives had been recruited to the role, she was not always clear about the expectations of a unitary board or of non-executives. She asked whether there should be a more defined articulation of these expectations.
- 5.23 Rob Behrens said that the key to the relationship was trust, but there would and should be tensions. Non-executives were there to challenge the executive. However there was never enough Board time. He suggested we could develop offline tools to discuss areas of conflict. He said that in his experience, non-executives did not have a unified view. In conclusion Rob Behrens said that the governance rules were outdated and needed to evolve in a way that worked better.

Changes by 2019

- 5.24 Jon Shortridge said that presentations should be shorter and more focussed, as Board members will have read the papers. The Corporate Health Performance Report and Operations Performance Report were too detailed and should focus on key issues. Ruth Sawtell agreed, saying that performance review should focus on progress against the strategy.

- 5.25 Michael King suggested that, as was the case at LGSCO, there could be off-agenda workshops to look at areas of interest in more detail.
- 5.26 Dean Fathers said that the Care Quality Commission do a well-led review asking what kept Board members awake at night, and considered how aligned this was with concerns identified by staff. Ideally Board discussion should be around resolving staff concerns.

Conclusion

- 5.27 The Board **noted** the report, and **agreed** that an external review of Board effectiveness would take place in 2018/19.
- 5.28 The Board **noted** that the findings of the session would be included in a further report to the Board on 22 March 18, to include reports from the Quality Committee and Audit & Risk Assurance Committee, and recommendations for Board development in 2018.

6. Annual Report and Accounts 2017/18

- 6.1 A report setting out an overview of the approach and timetable for the production of the Annual Report & Accounts for 2017/18 had been circulated.
- 6.2 Martyn Schofield said that the process was currently fully on track with the timeline set out at Annex 1 to the report
- 6.3 Dean Fathers asked if the report would include a section on sustainability. Martyn Schofield confirmed that it would.
- 6.4 The Board **noted** that:
- A report on key messages and proposed content for the governance statement would be submitted to the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee on 1 March 2018 and to the Board on 22 March 2018.
 - The drafted Governance Statement and update on the narrative for the Annual Report would be submitted to the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee on 10 May 2018 and to the Board on 21 June 2018.

7. Any Other Business

- 7.1 Ruth Sawtell asked whether for an update on the implementation of the General Data Protection Regulations. Amanda Campbell replied that this was on track and that there would be a report to the Board on 22 March 2018.

Action: Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Services to prepare a report for the Board on 22 March 2018.

7.2 Dean Fathers asked if PHSO intended to produce a Fair Pay Statement by April 2018. Amanda Campbell said that this was not a legal requirement, but that it would be good practice to do so.

Action: Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Services to prepare a Fair Pay Statement by 1 April 2018

7.3 Amanda Campbell informed the Board that the number of unallocated cases had moved away from the trajectory reported to the Board on 14 December 2017. Investigations and assessments were now combined into a single process. There were currently 700 unallocated cases, whereas monthly throughput was about 300 cases per month. We expected all current cases to be allocated by the end of March. However incoming work was still being queued. This position had arisen due to an increased investment in staff training, and a six-week lag in recruitment plans. Despite this position it was projected that unallocated cases would now be within tolerance by July rather than October. The situation was being monitored carefully and the Board would be updated further in March.

7.4 The Chair reminded the Board that Elisabeth Davies has been shortlisted for the 2018 Non-Executive Director Awards. The award ceremony takes place at Claridge's on 21 March 2018, the evening before the next Board meeting in March. He urged Board members to attend.

7.5 The Chair said that the Board meeting on 22 March 2018 would be Jon Shortridge's last meeting.

8 Review of the meeting

8.1 The Chair asked Board members for any comments on the meeting or the way it had been run.

8.2 Dean Fathers said that the papers were concise, well written and clear. The meeting had been good-humoured and there had been much constructive challenge.

8.2 Elisabeth Davies said that it had helpful to have the two-stage process behind the business planning paper, and helpful to have input at the development stage.

8.3 Ruth Sawtell said that it had been good to have a full meeting devoted to strategy issues. She welcomed the fact that the meeting had finished ahead of time.

8.4 Jon Shortridge remarked that he preferred the room to the previous Millbank boardroom. The configuration was more inclusive, and facilitated good eye-contact.

8.5 Alex Allan said that the meeting had run smoothly and had not been allowed to drag out to fill the allotted time.

9 Next meeting

9.1 The next meeting would be on 22 March 2018 in London.

The meeting ended at 14:45