# BCI East of England Forum

## Committee Meeting: 10:00-13:00 18th May 2018

### *Willow Room, ARM3, Main Reception Building*

### *110 Fulbourn Road, Cambridge CB1 9NJ*

#### **Minutes**

**Attendees**

Mark Suttle, Chair

Richard Verrinder, Vice Chair

Brian Kinch, Secretary

Ken Clark, Committee Member & Host

Josh Subair, Committee Member (part, by telephone)

Tim Cracknell, Committee Member (part, by telephone)

**Apologies**

Adrian Jolly, Committee Member

Jim Barrow, Committee Member

David West, Ex-officio Member

**Welcome and Chair’s Opening Remarks**

MS drew the meeting to order – at this point only TC was present on the phone - and extended thanks, on behalf of the Committee, to KC (and to ARM generally) for hosting the meeting and providing breakfast and refreshments.

**Review and approval of Minutes of last meeting, 9th February 2018**

The Committee expressed its thanks to BK for producing the previous minutes, since published on the BCI web page for the Forum, and ratified that they were a thorough and accurate summary.

BK apologised for the delay in publication.

**Note/record update on actions, 9th February 2018**

*Prior meeting actions brought forward:*

* 04/151217 – Complete on the Business Resilience Forum. MS introduced DW directly to the BRF team. DW was very open and supportive to closer liaison. MS admitted there had been nothing specific discussed on the Local Resilience Forums but, following the positive contribution that had been made by the Peterborough LRF to a prior East of England Forum event, the Committee felt this was still relevant to raise. BK expressed/reiterated a point previously made by TC that the Management Committee do not have exposure to whom the Forum events are publicised to, and MS concurred that, subject to GDPR constraints, it would be useful to have a directory of contacts.

**Action 01/180518 – MS to check with DW whether the BCI informs the Local Resilience Forums of the East of England Forum events.**

**Action 02/180518 – RV to liaise with his Essex Resilience Forum colleague, especially from a Fire Service perspective, to get his permission to be copied in to subsequent East of England Forum communications.**

JS joined the meeting by teleconference.

* 07/151217 – Closed. MS confirmed he had received a general response from BCI Central Office about GDPR, but the question of “what are the BCI doing about GDPR?” never got raised at the March Forum. GDPR is the subject of a separate “Matters Arising”, see below.
* 15/151217 – Complete. Feedback collated relative to the new BCI website is the subject of a separate agenda item later at this meeting.

*Actions from 9th February 2018:*

* 01 - Closed. JS reiterated that Blue Chip were generally supportive of hosting an event provided there was clear benefit for them. With the numbers involved it looks as though the David Thorp strategy update aimed for the summer is probably the most sensible (see later).
* 02 – Closed. There were no excess funds raised for the March Forum and any funds in that category would have remained with BCI Central Office as the administrators in any event.
* 03 – Closed. MS had taken up the apparent lack of communication regarding the Forum event, as reported by some of the Committee, with DW. He had confirmed that TC had been sent all the e-mails but the first had inexplicably “bounced” prior to delivery; plus, that JS had been inadvertently omitted because he lived outside of the catchment (since remedied). MS felt that there remained something of a “post code lottery” regarding who did/did not receive communications, but conceded that anyone searching for an event could probably pick these up from the BCI website if they knew where to search.
* 04 – Closed. BK reported that there was a real “mixed bag” of records of other Forum/Chapter meetings and content, including various formats and different access restrictions. The need for standardisation, especially in recognition of any potential contravention under the terms of GDPR needs to be raised with BCI Central Office.

**Action 03/180518 – BK to put this specifically in as a discussion point at the David Thorp strategy update session scheduled for the summer.**

* 05 – Complete. MS had produced the completed March Forum checklist prior to that event.
* 06 – Closed. KC reiterated apologies that the ARM Legal representative had, in the end, been unavailable to present at the March forum event and Roundtable, but all agreed that her replacement from Mk2 Consulting had been an excellent choice.
* 07 – Complete. Promotional e-mails for the March Forum event had been sent.
* 08 – Complete. RV had circulated information regarding the March Forum in advance of the event to his contacts.
* 09 – Complete. All presentation logistics/requirements for the March Forum had been given to MS on a timely basis.
* **10 – Carried Forward. MS does have regular dialogue with the BRF but neither he, nor KC (who, owing to a ‘diary malfunction’ had not been able to attend the last BRF event as planned), have yet specifically raised the question of a “jointly branded” event.**
* 11- Closed. The offer from Stansted to accommodate a meeting/Forum is still live, but it is suggested that we look to avoid busy times such as the summer for logistical reasons.
* 12 – Closed. BK advises that those offering premises/support/funding for Forum events or meetings really need a definitive date/time requirement to fully assess and commit. KC reiterated his kind offer to accommodate all Management Committee meetings at ARM as a default, but has stressed that he cannot accommodate an event in July as the Lecture Theatre is already fully booked.
* 13 – Complete. RV advised, similarly to the conclusion to action 12/090218, above, that the Essex Resilience Forum would be willing to host a Forum meeting or event, but they need to know the specific date and time requirements.
* 14 – Closed. AJ and JS had been in contact regarding the March Forum in advance and, ultimately, there were plenty of questions that were asked and aimed at the panel.

**Review of GDPR (March Forum) and ensuing contact from BCI**

In the interests of covering the last Forum event whilst, particularly, JS (who had run the Roundtable panel session) was available to contribute, MS brought this topic forward on the agenda.

BK had provided detailed feedback received from the attendees of the March Forum as part of the pre-read to this meeting. Specific comments (anonymised/sanitised) were:

* 1. Useful and informative
	2. Good range of voices
	3. Some particularly strong presenters
	4. Sequence of panel a bit off
	5. 1st session was both poorly targeted and transparently a product pitch
1. Best GDPR event I have been to!! Well done.
2. Very well organised and informative
3. Informative, professional, very effective
4. Very informative and useful event today. Thank you!
	1. Nice exercise to begin with – but not GDPR
	2. Excellent legal advice
	3. Good talks
	4. Overall worthwhile for GDPR
	5. Interesting day
	6. Would have preferred less on BCM and more on the GDPR
	7. Certain sessions were excellent
	8. Very informative
	9. Comprehensive
	10. Re-assuring
	11. Engaging
	12. Interesting
	13. Relevant
	14. A bit long
	15. Fantastic event and pleasing to see so many attendees in this part of the region, and such open engagement
	16. Long way for many of us to travel, and certainly some stopped at hotels overnight. Suggests strong appetite for content, and maybe that cost and location is not too much of an obstacle if we get it right
	17. Great surroundings, and administration and direction (and food!) first class
	18. Not sure we really did justice to the BRF presentation/positioning
	19. AJ’s comment about logistics in helping carry equipment turned out to be prophetic!
	20. Case study/table-top exercise, whilst good, was insufficiently tailored and felt incongruous vis-à-vis GDPR. Some participants found difficulty relating
	21. Product pitch was not especially well received
	22. Good quality give-aways, especially Horizonscan pens and “To Do” ring folders
	23. Fantastic substitute presentation, albeit some cross-over with other materials
	24. Some presentations were surprisingly candid, but think that proved beneficial in view of timing
	25. Feel we lost people before panel and this would have been better positioned earlier in the day

MS summarised that the event had, overall, been very successful, that the venue had been a good choice, and that he had received positive comments about using Ipswich rather than more traditional parts of the region, plus that hosting at a football stadium added additional interest and novelty. He considered the hospitality team were excellent, and whilst the facilities were undoubtedly a little tired/well used, they were wholly functional and welcoming. He considered the content was generally excellent, with one or two “stand-out” sessions, and that whilst the non-GDPR material had proved a little disconnected, it was clear that some people did enjoy it.

MS expressed his thanks, on behalf of the Committee, to the BCI Central Office for underwriting the costs for any shortfall. At £25 per attendee, MS felt that all those who came to the event had a bargain.

KC felt the March Forum was a notable step-up from previous Forum events. For example, whilst he had considered the one held in Romford was good, this was far better.

RV felt the table-top exercise lacked time and the lack of direct connection GDPR meant that it jarred somewhat. BK agreed and felt that elements of preparation and quality were not ideal.

Regarding a “product pitch”, on reflection MS felt that this was a mistake when attendees are being asked to pay to attend the event and that, as a principle, the Committee should not look to do something like that in the future. KC agreed and felt that the pricing and promotion felt incongruous.

JS enquired what others had felt about the Roundtable/panel session. He indicated he wished he had introduced himself as a member of Committee as some attendees seemed confused about his role. And he felt perhaps he should have “gone with the flow” in terms of the questions the audience wanted to ask.

MS and BK stressed that JS’ session was the most challenging in terms of session timing (featuring last on a Friday, and right after the break) and that, if we had this sort of event again, the panel should be moved to earlier in the day. MS advised he felt in the circumstances JS had done a fine job and had elicited lots of questions – so much so that the conversation had to be closed prematurely to observe time constraints. Having questions pre-written for the panel was considered good preparation.

TC indicated that whilst he had been unable to make the Forum event, he was curious about whether the venue location had been acceptable. BK advised that both he, and several others attending, had stopped overnight in a nearby cheap hotel, suggesting that many saw the time and value commitment as very worthwhile.

RV was curious as to why one piece of feedback was for “less on BCM” bearing in mind that is the *raison d’etre* of the Forum. MS agreed and wondered whether the comment was out of context and only related to the fact that one session was not about GDPR *per se*. The Committee agreed and felt it would have been difficult to have done more on GDPR.

MS acknowledged that the BRF presentation might have been more suitable spooling on a TV screen and discussed, in passing, over the allocated breaks rather than trying to juggle between different laptops on the main presentation screen.

**Action 04/180518 – In that the March Forum was, predominately, an AJ-coordinated event, and he was unavailable for this meeting, BK is to contact him to ask for any other feedback that might have been missed.**

**Action 05/180518 – Reflecting upon the accessibility challenges of an event based up several flights of stairs, BK is to ask JB to add “disabled and accessibility checks” to his meeting preparation spreadsheet.**

**Action 06/180518 – MS to ask DW to add “accessibility needs?” to the Survey Monkey (or CRM) registrations to future Forum events.**

**Any other matters arising from past meeting minutes**

Returning to the earlier, deferred, agenda item, MS asked whether there were any additional matters arising from the minutes of the February Management Committee.

Being no other issues, MS turned back to the issue of GDPR. He indicated he had received a request from BCI Central Office, via DW, to confirm that no-one on the Committee past or present will have been storing data subject information and personal data on their own devices. MS advised that he had replied to say that undoubtedly many of the Committee would, indeed, have such information including contact details and copies of past minutes, etc.

MS had indicated, on behalf of the Management Committee, that the Forum were unable to provide assurance of compliance. DW had reportedly indicated that, in an otherwise “low risk” membership and mutual interest environment, the BCI Central Office were more concerned about structured data in the likes of spreadsheets or databases, which the BCI would want deleted from any unauthorised location.

BK advised that, in the days before Forum constituent communications were administered from BCI Central Office, he used to receive a spreadsheet from the BCI circa once per month with details of all eligible members for him to use (as Secretary) for outgoing communications purposes. BK indicated such spreadsheets/databases would almost certainly still be held in accordance with e-mail retention policies by his former employer, but that he would no longer have access to them since leaving that job.

MS indicated that he considered the storage of old data by a former employer would have to fall under that organisation’s data retention and protection policies and that it would be unrealistic to expect an individual to intervene and attempt to arrange deletion. The Committee concurred.

MS advised that contact being made electronically to the listed East of England contact e-mail address had always been routed on to his own personal (work) e-mail, and that whilst the BCI Central Office had asked him to use the East of England e-mail for accessing and responding, he is unable to because it is a “web-mail” facility to which his employer blocks access. Consequently, DW has indicated the BCI Central Office are content to allow correspondence exchanges to continue as they are, and that past e-mail correspondence is considered acceptable and low risk.

BK queried what he should do with all the old Forum hard copy files back to inauguration of the South and East of England Forum in 2003.

**Action 07/180518 – BK to burn/destroy all old Forum hard copy records**

* BREAK -

At this point, TC and JS left the teleconference.

**Future Committee and Forum meeting plans**

On reconvening, MS indicated that he would be happy to host the next Committee meeting at M&G/Prudential in Chelmsford. The Committee expressed their thanks for this offer

**Action 08/180518 – MS to organise the next Committee meeting at Chelmsford**

Regarding the proposed BCI strategy update from David Thorp, BK reminded the Committee that the “placeholder” date of 20th July was considered, per KC, too close to school holidays and that he had therefore put David Thorp on stand-by for 6th July or 13th July. Unfortunately, though, JB was unable to attend either date and, as the Committee’s principal representative at all past BCI strategy discussions, there is a sense that he really should be there. MS concurred.

BK asked whether the BCI strategy update is something that the Committee wanted as a Forum event or simply as a detailed briefing and discussion with the Committee? The consensus was the latter and, although BK cautioned at the last David Thorp session (Forum event) there had been an assurance there would be a follow-up, the Committee felt a more direct session with David would allow a better and more tailored exchange, and that the update to the Forum constituents could be provided in summary by a Committee member later in the year.

**Action 09/180518: Looking to accommodate JB and avoid holidays generally, BK is to ask David Thorp whether he could do a date in June or September, meaning that the next Forum event is likely to be in October.**

**Action 10/180518 – BK to liaise with JS about Blue Chip accommodating the best date (June or September) once expressed by David Thorp, per the above action.**

BK enquired whether the topic of Brexit is still the leading discussion point for the Autumn Forum. MS suggested that the content should best be informed by the availability of speakers. He indicated that he has a contact from Ricardo in the incident management field, covering the likes of the oil and gas industry, and specifically focusing on the “do’s and don’ts” of exercising. And that he has also seen an excellent presentation (at the BRF and at the BCI World Conference) from Marks and Spencer on the approach to BCM.

BK had also, as part of the meeting pre-read, drawn the Committee attention to HEBCoN, Critical Arc, R3S and Fortress.

**Action 11/180518 – BK to add all the above presentation options from MS and himself to the list of suggested future topics.**

**Action 12/180518 – BK to specifically approach HEBCoN regarding an interest in speaking at the Autumn Forum, and for reciprocity bearing in mind they do not appear to have a local East of England representation on their Committee.**

BK reminded the Committee that there are still open offers to present from Thinking Software, Eminent, and maybe even E.on. Plus that IASME, although likely targeting the BRF, had also previously expressed an interest in talking to the Forum.

MS advised, regardless of when the David Thorp strategy update is ultimately scheduled for, he would look to make sure that a decision for the Autumn Forum is made in June. RV agreed and indicated it is essential that adequate time be provided to secure speakers and sort logistics and promotion.

**Action 13/180518 – MS to ensure action 08/180518, above, results in a Committee meeting in June irrespective, in order that an Autumn Forum decision can be made therein.**

KC indicated he liked the idea of creating a different perspective and seeking a different sectoral view, increasing reach and keeping the Forum topics fresh. He suggested maybe a headline topic of “people” and expressed interest particularly in the challenges associated with working from home.

RV agreed and wondered whether this could extend to technology failure during snow owing to capacity issues. KC concurred, especially in circumstances where traditional management dogma means there is a reluctance to declare a “crisis” situation or to coordinate matters as a business continuity incident. RV agreed and indicated, in his experience, often different Directors in different areas will end up making different decisions whilst diagnosis and exacerbation issues impact over several days.

KC cited an example of a tragic death in a US office which exposed lack of training and advice as to how to handle matters sensitively and appropriately, including communications to next of kin.

**Action 14/180518 – BK is to raise with Stansted Airport whether they would be willing to provide accommodation for, and a key note speaker at, the Autumn Forum, looking to manage people-related incidents (and maybe majoring on the recent fire issue at the terminal).**

Beyond the Autumn Forum, KC suggested a focus again on cyber would be a good idea for the March 2019 Forum. RV agreed and wondered whether this could be linked specifically to critical national infrastructure/utilities. The Committee agreed to pencil this in for the March 2019 Forum event.

**Action 15/180518 – BK is to put cyber/CNI/utilities as the suggested event topic for March 2019.**

BK questioned whether, owing to the passage of time, any of the suggested future topics on the agenda list were now considered less relevant/obsolete?

**Action 15/180518 – On Committee direction, BK is to delete Grenfell and MillRaceIT from the list of suggested future topics.**

**BCI Web-site, Forum page and BCI response**

MS advised he had collated and summarised all Committee feedback relative to the new BCI website and fed back to DW at BCI Central Office. The Committee thanked MS for a good summary.

The ensuing response from DW had rectified or advanced some issues, which the Committee expressed thanks for (e.g. adding the missing Committee member names; checking whether groups of words can be searched as a single string to improve search responses), raised several areas of continuing potential concern; specifically:

* Navigating to the Forum, whilst meeting the ethos of a “three-click” rule, still feels less than intuitive and the testing on this had been undertaken by non-Members.
* The orange buttons provided adjacent to collateral does not take the user to the suggested collateral, but to another search area where the search functionality is sub-optimal.
* There is no apparent central list detailing tangible “member benefits”, merely a pop-up on individual collateral if a non-Member tries to access it; some of which seems a little strange e.g. the Business Continuity Awareness Week (BCAW) materials requires Member log-in.
* Questions of ownership in that material appears under the East of England Forum which we were not aware of, nor were able to promote.
* The website events booking module is significantly late in delivery and the interim Survey Monkey approach is less than ideal.
* Past Continuous Professional Development records have been omitted which seems an odd, if conscious, decision bearing in mind the focus on CPD going forward.
* The “opt in” to the Community Directory (supposedly for reasons of GDPR) was not known by any of the Committee

The Committee agreed some of these matters should be raised direct with David Thorp when the Committee meet with him.

**Action 16/180518 – MS to raise these issues at the David Thorp strategy update session, when scheduled.**

**South and London Forum: shared plans**

The Committee noted that DW had been unable to attend today’s Committee partly because he was attending a London Forum event, of which the Committee were unaware. MS indicated he had not heard from his opposite number of the London Forum for some while, but that presumably the event (as part of BCAW) had been promoted and publicised within the London catchment and on the BCI website, and had simply been missed.

The South Forum have not had an event themselves for a while and the Chair had recently advised that there had been several of the Committee who had needed to step down. The East of England Forum Committee wished the South Forum well during this change of personnel.

**Nominated Charity**

Following on from the excellent initiative, and harrowing background circumstances, reported at the last Committee meeting in February, regarding raising awareness and funds for the Chelmsford homeless charity, CHESS, BK enquired whether the Committee felt it was appropriate for the Forum itself, or for the BCI generally, to have a nominated charitable organisation that it supports each year? Many of the Committee reflected that charitable support is very often a “good corporate citizen” initiative and one which the BCI should probably embrace, especially in areas where resilience or recovery is at the heart of the charity venture/s.

**Action 17/180518 – MS to raise the issue of the consideration of a BCI nominated charity with David Thorp.**

**Any other business**

KC reiterated that he considered it important that “people” issues remained at the forefront of the Forum’s thinking about future events and initiatives important.

RV advised he is no longer in full time employment and today represented his first “working day” since leaving the Council.

BK advised that he is in the process of re-joining the payment scheme, Visa, where he had worked in the early 2000s, and that this may have a future impact on the extent of his contributions, but that he hoped he can continue.

The Committee generally expressed some disquiet about using the ”disaster-face” selfie initiative for BCAW in that, as an organisation trying to promote forethought, calmness and resilience in the face of adversity, the BCI promoting looks of panic and angst seems inappropriate. It was recognised that this was an attempt at some harmless fun, but almost certainly ill-conceived.

**Action 18/180518: ALL to provide MS with a list of questions and issues that they would like raised in the session with David Thorp.**

Being no further business, the meeting was drawn to a close.