# BCI East of England Forum

## Committee Meeting: 09:30-13:00 15th December 2017

### *Queen Mary Room, Park Inn by Radisson Palace,*

### *Church Road, Southend-on-Sea, Essex, SS1 2AL*

#### Minutes

**Attendees**

Mark Suttle, Chair

Richard Verrinder, Vice Chair

Brian Kinch, Secretary

Jim Barrow, Committee Member

Tim Cracknell, Committee Member

Ken Clark, Committee Member

Josh Subair, Committee Member

**Apologies**

Adrian Jolly, Committee Member

David West, Ex-officio Member

**Welcome and Chair’s Opening Remarks**

MS drew the meeting to order a little later than planned owing to transportation/inclement weather issues delaying the arrival of some of the Committee. MS expressed his thanks to BK, and to FICO, for again providing the funding for the meeting room and acknowledged that, unfortunately, this would be the last time FICO would be offering this owing to BK moving on from their employ.

**Review and approval of Minutes of last meeting, 17th November 2017**

The Committee unanimously approved the previous draft minutes and commented that these were, as usual, a comprehensive record.

**Action 01/151217 – BK to produce an “approved for publication” version of the minutes from 17th November meeting and circulate these to the Committee for information and have DW publish them on the Forum web page.**

**Note/record update on actions, 15th September 2017 and 17th November 2017**

MS indicated that he would prefer to address the updates to the more recent actions (i.e. 17th November) first as many of these may effectively supersede matters from 15th September. The Committee agreed to this approach.

* 1/171117 - Closed

MS advised he will, on future Forum event introductions, provide to the audience simply start, end, break and running order. However, he will also share a timed agenda with the Committee and the presenters only and will ask that presenters respect and observe times as far as practicable.

TC enquired how flexible, as a Committee, we will permit presentation lengths to vary based upon interest and engagement. MS considers that the flexibility will revolve around changing break times or durations rather than having to interrupt any presenter mid-flow.

JS queried whether managing timings on the day would be over-ambitious but BK indicated that, as presenters are required to share their slideware in advance, this should be possible and a more robust approach may need to be taken where a presenter’s material seems unrealistically long/detailed for the allocated duration.

**Action 02/151217 – JB will put revised meeting structure and convention on to an updated Forum meeting check list.**

* **2/171117 – Carried Forward**

**As DW has been absent across the pre-Christmas period, BK will follow up with him in the New Year about the need to check and approve with the Committee any images being used for Forum meetings.**

* 3/171117 – Closed

Matters concerning Survey Monkey, registration confirmation, and the web site/Forum web page generally are the subject of a separate agenda item later in this meeting.

* **4/171117 – Carried Forward**

**MS to liaise with Amanda, his main contact with the BRF, to confirm the Forum’s support for the next meeting, when arranged, with KC as the Forum’s attendee/presenter.**

* 5/171117 - Complete

The Forum strategy, and any potential alignment with LRFs or the BRF, was actively discussed. The Committee agreed that, for the Forum and in keeping with the BCI’s Central Office strategy of partner where appropriate, it should look at alignment opportunities for individual meetings as they arise, but not to slavishly pursue any direct amalgamation.

BK queried whether maybe Forum events should be shifted to 6-monthly and to include an element of mixing conference-style and exhibition (i.e. similar to the BRF). KC queried whether this would be viewed competitively either to the BRF or to BCI World, but MS assured BRF actively want the BCI Forum involved in their own events, and that there would only be a risk of competition if the Forum events were arranged too close in terms of date and geographic proximity. MS further advised that those exhibiting at BRF were typically consultants, BC transport firms, and a couple of others, plus that the event was hosted by a WRA supplier; so the extent of “competition” was limited.

RV queried the constitution of attendees at the BRF in order to assess the level of risk of repetition or cross-over. MS indicated the BRF attendees were not typically BCI members or even those with a BCI membership interest *per se*, but he acknowledged this might be a geographically based legacy (prior to the BCI East of England Forum being allocated the Peterborough postcode, the BCI considered that area relatively under-represented). RV was reassured about the limited cross-over risk but indicated that if there are individuals in and around Peterborough (or indeed further afield) who have continuity and resilience interests but are not personnel that the Forum can readily contact or invite, this does suggest a potential disconnect in BCI reach. TC agreed and asked how the Committee could hope to fulfil its objective of extending BCI membership if the contact pool remained as members in the constituency and those who have expressed a past interest in the Forum. BK wondered whether a “member-get-member” promotion might be suitable?

**Action 03/151217 – As a first step in extending reach, MS to liaise with Steve Dance to see whether Forum events can be directly promoted to BRF attendees too.**

The Committee universally agreed that Forum presence at the BRF and the LRFs going forward is important. KC suggested maybe the BCI centrally should even take an exhibition stand at those events, and TC concurred indicating BCI presence amongst an interested audience with no direct knowledge of or prior interest in joining the BCI had to be a good thing. MS agreed and feels the BCI central office should be more directly involved.

**Action 04/151217 – MS to liaise with DW about BCI central office assuming more of a direct presence at future LRFs and BRF**

BK brought the discussion back to the evaluation of whether one of the Forum events in 2018 should be tied in to an adjacent exhibition, whether one arranged by the Forum itself or one arranged by others. TC and JB felt that this may indeed be a good idea and considered that the March 2018 event being targeted for Endeavour House in Ipswich may be just the sort of venue to accommodate (and, as a County Council building, unlikely to cause any competition issues). RV concurred but indicated Endeavour House had unfortunately already been pre-booked by other parties on the suggested date for the March 2018 Forum, and therefore he was now looking at a 50-person meeting room at the District Council offices, opposite; but this would most likely not be suitable for adjacent exhibition space. RV suggested that future intended use of Council offices would need to be booked with greater lead time, and indicated he would have less influence over securing Council offices in the future as he is in the process of leaving the Council’s employ.

JS indicated the firm he works for (Blue Chip) could accommodate a meeting for up to 18 people, maybe more if standing or following removal of desks. MS expressed his thanks on behalf of the Committee for that offer and indicated it is certainly something they would want to follow up on in the future, even if not directly for the March event, especially in light of the changing circumstances for BK and RV.

**Action 05/151217 - JS to determine the capacity limitations for meetings at Blue Chip in order to allow the Committee to evaluate future use.**

* 06/171117 – Complete

A “register of ideas” for future events had been published by BK as part of the agenda for this meeting.

* 07/171117 – Closed

In DW’s absence across the pre-Christmas period, BK indicated he had not had the chance to follow-up on matters of GDPR compliance and potentially unauthorised PII held. BK did indicate, however, that he had seen the BCI central office were recruiting for someone to deal with risks and compliance for the Institute and felt that this was a good initiative, and likely a direct response to regulatory compliance challenges. MS/JS agreed.

Nonetheless, in a governance context TC indicated he considered the BCI still potentially exposed and cited the recent issue he had raised, via BK to BCI central office, about the risk of voting misrepresentation/compromise which he felt had never been satisfactorily responded to.

**Action 06/151217 – BK to re-send his last e-mail regarding the potential voting compromise direct to David Thorp to ask that this be formally addressed.**

**Action 07/151217 – MS to liaise with DW/BCI central office generally to determine the BCI’s stated position on GDPR issues in advance of the March 2018 Forum (because GDPR is the focus topic there).**

* 08/171117 – Complete

KC had received affirmation from the ARM Legal contacts that they would be happy to present on GDPR issues at the March 2018 Forum. Additionally ARM are in the process of recruiting another person dedicated to Data Protection so s/he could also be involved.

* 09/171117 – Complete

RV had confirmed with his Information Governance contacts, Lauri Almond and Scott Salmon, that one or other would be available to present on the practical implications of GDPR preparations on the afternoon of 16th March 2018 in Ipswich. RV is passing contact information direct to AJ.

* 10/171117 - Complete

MS has confirmed with Russ Timpson that he is happy to do a data loss scenario for his Crisis Boardroom product as part of the GDPR-focused event on 16th March 2018 in Ipswich or similar. MS advised that Russ is ideally looking for 90 minutes to present, including a practical case study. Additionally, MS indicated Russ is happy to fund the provision of lunch/refreshments.

* 11/171117 – Complete

JS confirmed his knowledge on GDPR preparations is up to date and that he is happy to field or coordinate a “Q&A” session around GDPR.

* 12/171117 - Complete

Pursuant to the update on action 05/171117, above, RV confirmed he had established contact and reached out to provisionally book the alternative of the District Council offices in Ipswich. Train and car accessibility for the venue are both very good

**Action 08/151217 – RV to finalise, in liaison with MS, arrangements regarding meeting room logistics (including any cost, capacity limitations, breakout and/or exhibition potential, catering arrangements, etc.)**

MS suggested that, if the District Council logistics proved too challenging to negotiate, then maybe a viable alternate would be Regus in Ipswich. However, owing to location on an out-of-town industrial/business park, this is far more remote in terms of access.

In response to JB’s question as to who could be called/relied upon as an exhibitor, BK indicated he had established various contacts in the continuity and resilience areas at the recent IP Expo event and that he would be happy to follow-up with them as appropriate.

**Action 09/151217 – BK to add the list of contacts/potential presenters and exhibitors to the future “register of ideas” on the next Committee agenda.**

* 13/171117 - Complete

JB’s excellent summary of the Chapter Leaders’ Conference, embedded to the previous meeting minutes, was extensively discussed.

The Committee noted that, whilst under Lorraine Darke’s stewardship, the Board and BCI central office approach had been one of oversight, the new regime and David Thorp’s approach was more heavily focused on matrix management. BK indicated he was concerned the matrix approach risked too much fluidity and lack of accountability, especially as those newly empowered by the Board or governance structure grappled with the remit and opportunities presented. There was also concern about a potential “crisis of identity” with the BCI continuity heritage now yielding more to the term “resilience”. The comparative was drawn with the early days of the BCI where others considered “disaster recovery” or “crisis management” the more descriptive terms, but these did not prevail. To be fair, as JB drew out, the reference to resilience is mainly evident in the form of a “strap-line” and this can be adapted and changed as time, and changing market forces, so demand.

RV compared with the Government strategy, who now have website called Resilience Direct, which is aimed at emergency planning.

BK acknowledged that recognition of *de rigeur* terms is important, but cautioned that those seen as coming “late to the game” risk being considered as too much “me too”, rather than a leading light. He used the example of FICO who are, to this day, an organisation that provides the most commercially successful deployment of neural network technology (through their Falcon Fraud Manager product) but, in more lately adopting reference to *en vogue* terms such as Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning have had difficulty differentiating themselves from more recent competitors.

MS commented that the drive toward an inclusive engagement model (irrespective of member status) means that the BCI no longer feels like a body for the members; and questioned whether that is that a bad thing? The Committee expressed concern that if the BCI is not going to be an organisation first and foremost for its members then, frankly, why pay to be a member?

JB agreed that, in the communications at the Chapter Leaders’ Conference, it was not well defined precisely what the advantage is in being a member, especially in terms of delineating what is “in the tent” for members only (e.g. GPG and white papers).

KC stated he felt the value of being a member is diminishing; plus that the BCI World Conference is expensive but not necessarily of significant content value. DRJ and DRII was felt to be more beneficial, and the right to use post-nominal letters (one of the few remaining BCI member advantages) was of insufficient tangible value to warrant the membership cost. JB suggested the post-nominals were of benefit when looking to differentiate oneself to potential recruiters but RV disagreed and said in his experience he found IOSH accreditation/experience is important but not BCI accreditation. TC concurred and indicated IOSH held greater legal/governance /compliance sway, but not so with BCI, and KC questioned that – if there is no regulatory benefit or consequences – then why do it? BK also agreed and cited the fact that at least three of the presiding Management Committee had, currently or in the recent past, found themselves the subject of a redundancy despite their BCI accreditation and position.

JS continued that in his experience there is a greater desire amongst recruiters and professionals to source those which emergency planning expertise, not necessarily business continuity.

MS summarised that, as a Committee, discussions frequently circle back to criticisms of, or an inability to determine adequate, value of membership and that, whilst a lot of expectation had been placed upon the Chapter Leaders’ Conference and the AGM to articulate those tangible benefits, it was clear the disquiet persists. MS noted that the insight offered by David Thorp at the Forum session hosted at ARM had been helpful, but clearly formative, and now – several months later – there is probably a strong argument to look again at having him come to just a Committee meeting to help redress the “value” question, not least in that the Committee should be the local mouthpiece for the BCI and actively able to articulate and promote it to others. KC agreed and suggested we aim to invite either David or another BCI dignitary to a future Management Committee. BK indicated that the question of inviting David is the subject of a later agenda item to this meeting

TC and RV indicated that, in keeping with other professionals - such as solicitors, doctors, accountants, auditors, etc – there should be a “tipping point” whereby to be classed, recognised and able to trade in the profession needs a certain level of demonstrable knowledge, accreditation, qualification and experience. Without this the BCI post-nominals appears simply a perfunctory or cosmetic addition.

TC compared the BCI value consideration questions to what is happening in another body, the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors. Often independent and cost-conscious professionals will need something compelling to aspire for, achieve and maintain qualification and accreditation. If it is simply “a badge” there is post-nominal “creep” where individuals use the logo or promote the accreditation without having paid and/or qualified. JB agreed and suggested that, unless the use of post-nominals was more assertively audited and enforced, there was little or no disincentive to those unscrupulous enough to suggest association. BK concurred and used the recent popular example of one of the winning candidates on the TV show, “The Apprentice”, who – in setting up his own website for an IT recruitment business – had used a professional body logo and suggestion of membership even though he had not paid and was not a member in his own right. Despite the public expose of his misrepresentation there was no apparent consequence, certainly as he went on to be the joint winner, and this is arguably sending the wrong message to society at large.

JB indicated the BCI is trying to stand-up a thorough Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programme to drive toward Chartered Institute status, and this would certainly include several standardised professional disciplines which should assist in elevating and maintaining the value of accreditation, qualification and post-nominals. Whilst TC recognised the aspiration he cautioned that the Institute of Risk Management had previously considered aiming for either Chartered or Royal Commission status, but had conclude there was little value in so doing.

KC questioned whether the BCI and continuity professionals in general would ever realistically get to the stage of mandatory CPD. He felt this unlikely and JB agreed, indicating really it would need a business-based paradigm shift, such as insurance companies insisting that insured organisations employ someone with adequate accreditation in their continuity and incident management disciplines to warrant, for example, lower premiums.

MS concluded by again indicating that this was another area of “membership value” debate that need to be rolled in to the later agenda item discussion about inviting David Thorp back to a future meeting.

* 14/171117 - Closed

The Committee agreed to defer formally raising the issue of how positive discrimination at Board level is being applied in favour of picking this up with David Thorp directly at a future Management Committee meeting, see below.

JB indicated, in that he had seen and heard the spirit of the positive discrimination evaluation and approach through the Chapter Leaders’ Conference, he had not seen much wrong with the recent invite for Board applicants excluding, this time, anyone from the UK, Switzerland or Nestle applying. He had sympathy with the exclusion statement, albeit he felt it could have been better positioned.

MS and KC felt the BCI should not have needed to adopt such a transparent approach as, to do so, had really jarred and risked criticism or disaffection. TC agreed and was surprised the BCI Board had adopted such an approach, and RV considered this poor judgement. JB understood but, in playing devil’s advocate, suggested to have not been transparent may have preserved hidden “ivory tower” processes, and needlessly raised hopes or prompted applications from candidates that would have been ineligible. BK agreed but indicated that such applicants, even if not suitable/arbitrarily unsuccessful on this occasion, gave a useful indication of interest and aspiration amongst the membership populace and a ready means of succession planning should anything befall existing Board Directors.

BK also suggested that, as with any elected body, participation should be broadly aligned with the constitution of the subscribing Members to ensure best representation. He postulated that if, say, 60% of paying members are from the UK then arguably 60% of the Board should consist of UK-based members. And failing that, irrespective the subscribing members should be allowed to nominate and vote for whoever they want to represent them regardless of age, sex, race, creed, colour, etc. Otherwise, in parody, the Conservative Government should appoint ministers from Labour and the Liberal Democrats to the cabinet because they are also politicians and are under-represented at the top table!

* BREAK -

Having finished the updates to the actions from 17th November 2017 prior to the break, MS progressed to a review of the actions from 15th September 2017 in the order in which they appeared in the published minutes:

* 01/150917 – Complete

BK has made all suggested style changes to the minutes.

* 02/150917 – Complete

MS had shared with JB in advance the residual topics to be raised at the Chapter Leaders’ Conference.

* 03/150917 – Complete

“Brexit” had been added to the agenda for the Committee meeting on 17th November 2017.

* 10/210417 – Complete

KC had circulated the Simon Worrall material on extended pandemic and manifestation.

* 04/150917 – Complete

JB had updated the meeting planning template to include confirming registrations.

* 07/160617 – Closed

Utility event has now been added to the future Forum event evaluation schedule and contact with an appropriate Environment Agency contact will be rolled into there.

* 10/160617 – Complete

MS had provided the Committee with an update on his BRF experience.

* 05/150917 – Complete

The need for BCM experience within the Board, and adequate influence of those with BCM experience, is covered within the new Articles and Bye-laws.

* 22/160617 - Closed

MS will be reflecting on Forum achievements later in this meeting.

* 23/160617 – Complete

BK has added “succession planning” and “term risk management” to the future Forum event evaluation schedule.

* 06/150917 – Complete

The positioning of “resilience” was covered at the Chapter Leaders’ Conference and the outcome discussed earlier in this meeting, see the update to action 13/171117, above.

* 07/150917 – Complete

MS has covered requirements with Russ Timpson for his future Crisis Boardroom presentation to also reflect on Grenfell and tall buildings fires, albeit this will need to be subsidiary to the main drive on GDPR breach.

* 08/150917 – Complete

BK has added “dignitary update offer” to the agenda.

* 09/150917 – Complete

BK has added “Airport” and “BARM” under the IT discipline area on the future Forum event evaluation schedule.

* 10/150917 – Closed

The Chapter Leaders’ Conference report from JB indicated that the issue of “co-opetition” and partnership has been actively considered and changes are being progressed by the BCI Board in terms of future working *entente cordiale*.

* 11/150917 – Closed

The potential need for construction and inclusion of Committee biographies on the website has been overtaken by events: see later discussion on the BCI website, below.

* 12/150917 - Complete

DW had publicised the November 2017 Forum event.

* 13/150917 – Complete

BK has added all the various suggestions to the future Forum event evaluation schedule.

* **14/150917 – Carried Forward**

**BK will follow-up with those who have offered premises/meeting room and catering support following agreement on the 2018 meeting content/schedule.**

* 15/150917 – Closed

MDP Wethersfield is noted as a possible future event location.

* 16/150917 – Complete

JB advises there is no intention to change Forum or Chapter designations *per se* at this point in time but the “community groups” arrangements generally are being considered on an on-going basis by the BCI Board.

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

No other matters arising were raised.

**Future potential Brexit event considerations**

The Committee debated whether there was a need and an appetite for a “Brexit”-specific event, and the best timing.

KC felt that, as a Committee, we should be doing more to help our constituents understand and prepare but the challenge is the “great unknown”. Regardless of the lack of direction and clarity from central Government, though, KC commented that his employer (ARM) had sent out a general communique/placeholder on potential Brexit issues and are informing their recruitment process accordingly.

The Committee agreed “Brexit” should be a significant and attractive topic provided it is approached in a practical and not scare-mongering (fear, uncertainty, doubt) context. The Committee believes October 2018 is probably best overall timing for any such event, as hopefully there may be more definitive information and greater clarity by then.

BK drew the comparison to Y2K: what was a fixed future date where necessary changes and impacts were inexact, but where most organisations undertook extensive preparations over the preceding months and years. He suggested the “head in the sand” and “wait and see” approach for the risks associated with the UK leaving the EU is therefore acutely dichotomous. JB agreed but considers the Brexit impacts are likely to have the dispensation of a long transition, whereas Y2K was an absolute hard stop.

MS suggested maybe any Brexit event should focus on a “bring your issues” surgery. The Committee agreed and felt that common issues such as future recruitment; the downsizing of labour intensive productions in EU markets (Poland, Romania, etc); data management; movement of people, assets and services cross-border; geographic business locations; dual and outsourcing considerations; etc would all be high on the “concern” agenda.

MS suggested the October 2018 Brexit event proposal be put in to the mix on the “Future Events” agenda item, below. This was agreed.

**BCI dignitary update offer**

In accordance with earlier discussions the Committee agreed that David Thorp (or another BCI dignitary) should be invited back to present just to the Committee at one of the meetings in the summer as, by then, greater progress against the revised strategy should have been completed and any residual items finalised.

**Action 10/151217 – BK to request David Thorp’s availability to attend one of the Management Committee meetings in the summer, or even the July Forum (which could be superseded by a dedicated Management Committee instead, see below).**

**Future Committee and Forum meeting plans**

The Committee ratified the proposal for a “GDPR” and “Crisis Boardroom” focused event in Ipswich for the March 2018 Forum, recognising the logistical arrangements already in place based upon earlier actions, see above. The Committee agreed a proposed timetable as follows:

16th March

0930 Arrival and refreshments

0945 Introduction by MS

1000 Crisis Boardroom with a case study on data breach, by Russ Timpson

1130 Legal view on GDPR preparations and requirements, including a Q&A session by KC’s ARM Legal representative

1230 Lunch

1315 “Word on the street” re GDPR by AJ

1415 Local Government (Information Governance) preparations and approach from RV’s ECC colleague Lauri Almond

1515 Round table and panel Q&A run by JS

1600 Thanks and summary by MS and end

**Action 11/151217 – Pursuant to action 08/151217, above, MS to conclude administrative arrangements for the March Forum and advise speakers of logistics and likely agenda timings.**

RV questioned whether there was a particular expectation or set of requirements from his colleague Lauri. TC suggested “5 key themes” and that attendees should be prompted to “bring your most awkward question with you”!

**Action 12/151217 – BK to allocate 20 minutes on the next Management Committee agenda to ensure the Committee are clear on content requirements and that the various contributors can meet that brief.**

**Action 13/151217 – Once details finalised for the March Forum, BK to produce a draft advert for promoting from c 6 weeks in advance.**

Regarding other Forum events going forward, MS enquired whether the Committee felt three per year was too many (onerous, resource-hungry, etc). JB and KC both indicated that they would be happy to reduce to two Forum events per annum, and RV concurred so long as the reduction to two meant that quality of content and venue were maintained or improved.

BK was more sceptical and cautioned that the Committee had set out its stall in its current format to do four events per year: three Forums and one “AGM” or yearly review. The latter had essentially already fallen back to a Committee-only event so a further reduction in Forum events would be a considerable divergence to original plan. BK felt that probably a better time for the Committee to have considered cutting back on events (as they had been forced to at certain stages in the past under the BCI South and East of England Forum vintage) would have been when regular attendance levels dropped below 10-15 people; but in that more recent events had typically attracted 20-30 people, and sometimes as many as 50+, the demand for events seemed high.

MS acknowledged all the comments and suggested, for 2018, that the Committee focuses principally on two events (the one in March, and another in October [or September if preferred]), with a view to only planning an event for July if topic, venue, appetite and resource availability were all in favour. As a fallback the July Forum might simply become an opportunity for the Management Committee to have an update/briefing from David Thorp, or similar, as mentioned earlier.

Overall the Committee concurred with the sense of MS’ proposal but KC suggested maybe considering making the July Forum event a “virtual” one instead of foregoing it completely (e.g. webinar or “open mic” session) as this would reduce the Committee administrative workload. This was generally welcomed, albeit JB cautioned even a “virtual” session would need some work. RV wondered whether the BCI Central Office could be relied upon to do more of the administration in support of a “virtual” session, but he expressed some doubts as other areas of administration had previously not been actively supported (such as producing and printing badges).

**Action 14/151217 – BK to update the “Future Events” agenda item on the next Management Committee agenda, outlining a specific requirement to establish plans for a major Forum event in October (or September) and a smaller Forum event in July.**

KC indicated that, for the Autumn Forum event, he would be happy to host again at the ARM facilities in Cambridge, which will have been finalised by then. The Committee gratefully acknowledged that offer.

**Follow-up on past offer of venue support for future Forums/Committee meetings**

In view of the March Forum being targeted for Ipswich, see previously, and the Autumn Forum being targeted for Cambridge, see above, the Committee agreed to defer following up on other offers already made until the next Management Committee.

**BCI Web-site & Forum page**

MS indicated that, following the update to the BCI website, he had solicited and received several comments individually from some of the Committee regarding the changes; many of these had been somewhat critical.

BK stated that he is sure most of the Committee, and Members at large, will have welcomed the drive to change the website; however, it had been a long time in changing and in the end appeared to go live with various important elements not finalised or missing altogether. It was also, in BK’s view, disappointing that the format adopted was “messy” and navigation unclear – almost a “misty front window to the shop”. The absence of concurrent changes to communication protocols (CRM, CMS) was also disappointing.

RV concurred and felt the absence of easy means to identify salient parties and make contact, even in the Members Only area, is probably an unfortunate oversight

TC felt it would be helpful to include an advert on the front screen delineating what is available to Members Only and what is not. JB agreed and likened the practice to that of “Which” magazine where non-subscribers are offered a sample or taster, but the full materials are limited to those paying a subscription.

TC also expressed concern that, in registering for an event, there is no apparent ability to access historical links i.e. once registered for an event, going back into the event details simply results in an advisory that one is already registered, but this means the individual cannot look at the promotional and location details on line.

JS indicated the route for finding local Forum or Chapter details is not intuitively sign-posted (Community -> Groups -> Geographic). BK concurred and indicated the Forum web page is not finalised and does not list all the Management Committee members.

JS further queried what is happening on Continuous Professional Development in that, for him, previous activity/material had disappeared on his profile, leaving no past commentary.

KC indicated that he felt more Members (and prospects) should be encouraged to access and use the website, and that there should have been a trial period where initial users could feedback any challenges and the development team still available to make necessary remediation and changes. He also feels that the BCI (and the various Forums, Chapters and associated events and partners) should be advertising and promoting the new website as the “go to” resource for any queries, with a rich content and easy user interface.

JB advised he found the new site disjointed and spartan, and found it difficult to negotiate a “scrolling navigation” style, rather than simply using a tiled convention as most users would be familiar with on standard operating systems.

MS considered the search and navigation capabilities significantly sub-optimal. For example, a search query of “Forum” simply leads to a handful of results, none of which concern any UK Forum whatsoever. And a search for “East of England Forum” leads to hundreds of results, the majority of which are led by matters in the Middle East! MS also cited the fact that, in trying to access a “front page” resource such as the Emergency Communications Report 2017 one is directed to “Login or Register”; and yet once the login has been completed it is then necessary to search again for the report to download it!

**Action 15/151217 – MS to collate all comments previously received, and made at the Management Committee, and to feedback to BCI Central Office.**

**South and London Forum: shared plans**

**Action 16/151217 - MS to contact the respective Chairs (Gayle re London Forum and Russ re South Forum) regarding mutually sharing plans for 2018.**

**Any other business**

In view of the time, MS indicated that the Committee should discuss the specifics of their 2017 experiences (prepared for the meeting) informally across the scheduled Christmas lunch immediately after the meeting. He expressed his sincere thanks to all the Committee for their efforts, commitment and support; and indicated feedback had universally been that the Forum had provided great events, with cracking speakers, on important topics – and all this for free. 2017 had set a great benchmark to exceed in 2018.

MS drew the meeting to a close and the Committee all wished each other a happy Christmas and a healthy and prosperous New Year.