

OFFICIAL

NOTE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE STEERING BOARD MEETING HELD ON 28 JANUARY 2015 AT CONCEPT HOUSE, NEWPORT AND ABBEY ORCHARD STREET, LONDON

Attendees:

Non Executive Directors

Bob Gilbert (Chair)
Gary Austin
Iain Maclean
Ralph Ecclestone
Tim Suter
Nora Nanayakkara

BIS

Brigid Feeny Deputy for Amanda Brooks

Intellectual Property Office

John Alty Chief Executive
Sean Dennehey Deputy Chief Executive
Louise Smyth Acting Chief Operating Officer
Rosa Wilkinson Director, Innovation & Strategic Communications
Neil Feinson Director, International Policy
Ros Lynch Director, Copyright & Enforcement
Dave King Acting Director, Finance
Paul Feldman Chief Technology Officer
Simon Haikney Head of EU and OHIM Policy
Thomas Walkden Senior Policy Advisor, IPD
Jonathan Rogers Corporate Planning & Performance Manager
Karen Powell Head of Governance & Risk
Kathryn Ratcliffe Head of Secretariat
Sally Jones Secretariat
Sue Henson Minutes

Observers

Samantha MacDonald

Action	Timing
Miss Wilkinson to circulate updated election guidance from Cabinet Office once received.	As soon as possible
Mr Alty to let Steering Board know outcome of meeting with Chris Bryant, Shadow Culture Minister.	February
Steering Board to meet Senior Leadership Team.	As soon as possible
Mr King to investigate financial report with reference to the patent applications against renewals.	As soon as possible
NEDs to send comments on the Strategy to Mr Haikney.	As soon as possible
Ms Lynch to look at the wording of the PIPCU objective.	As soon as possible
Miss Wilkinson to revise the wording of the 'reaching an audience of at least 100,000 businesses' ministerial target.	As soon as possible
NEDs to email comments on the 2015-2018 Corporate Plan document to Mr Walkden and Ms Smyth.	As soon as possible
Mr Dennehey to have discussion about Digital Vision with Mr Feldman and update the meeting.	As soon as possible

OFFICIAL

Action	Timing
Mr King to provide Steering Board with an update on OHIM potential income line.	Mr King
Mr Feldman to give Steering Board an update on the IT Strategy and Roadmap at the next meeting.	Next Steering Board: 31 March 2015
Mr Alty, Mr Austin, Mr King and Ms Smyth to discuss a further member of the Audit Committee with financial expertise.	As soon as possible

1. Chair's Introduction

1.1 Mr Gilbert welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular to Paul Feldon as newly recruited Chief Technology Officer and Samantha MacDonald who had come as an observer.

1.2 Special thanks and best wishes were given to Ms Ratcliffe on her last meeting before her maternity leave. Ms Ratcliffe will return for the Steering Board Awayday in October.

1.3 Mr Gilbert asked, as it was his first time in public office at the time of an election, what the rules were on purdah. Miss Wilkinson reported that they were still waiting updated election guidance from Cabinet Office. However, for Non Executive Directors (NEDs) it would be 'business as usual' during the election period, but they had to think about whether any activity they were involved in which could call into question political impartiality and lead to accusations that public money is being spent politically. NEDs should not be seen to do anything that competes with election campaign. Before the last election SCS were given permission to have meetings with pre-election contacts with the main opposition parties. If NEDs were approached by any parties with questions about the IPO, they should first get in touch with IPO for guidance.

Action

- **Miss Wilkinson to circulate updated election guidance from Cabinet Office once received.**

2. Apologies

2.1 There were no apologies.

3. Approval of minutes of the previous meeting

3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2014 were approved without amendment.

4. Update on actions

4.1 Mr Gilbert reviewed actions – the majority of which had been completed. Mr Feinson reported that dates for the next attaché visit to the IPO were being considered for 2016.

5. Declarations of Interest

5.1 There were no declarations of interest.

6. GOVERNANCE AND PERFORMANCE

6.1 Chief Executive's Report

6.1.1 Mr Alty highlighted key points from his report.

- The Minister realised time was limited but was keen to get things done ahead of purdah. Mr Alty reported he was having regular discussions about IPO's election preparations and would be meeting Chris Bryant, Shadow Culture Spokesman in February. Mr Alty said he would let everyone know the outcome of the meeting.
- The EU Single Market was active, Mr Alty met with Mr Cable last week and concluded they needed to resolve outstanding tensions, ie Copyright.
- Mr Alty reported that progress was being made on the Digital Agenda. A visit to IPO by Gareth Davies, BIS K&I DG on 23 January was very positive and Mr Davies was very and engaged and interested in digital policy making.
- Staff News: Mr Alty welcomed Mr Feldman as new Chief Technology. Mr Alty announced that Mr Neil Hartley would be assuming the Finance Director position on a job-share basis alongside his current role as Head of Corporate Services at Companies House. He would be joining IPO at the end of March. This was a move towards collaborating more with Companies House. Interviews for Chief Operating Officer would be conducted in the week commencing 2 February.
- Unitary Patent and Unified Patent Court: Progress was being made towards moving to a location for the patent court. Ms Makarewich-Hall had been leading the taskforce and a visit of judges to the Docklands (there would be financial implications if a court was located closer to the City). Mr Alty reported that they needed to fit out court premises but if they did not have a decision by 31 March, it would be delayed until after the election. Miss Wilkinson said that Lady Neville-Rolfe had praised the work carried out by Mr Feinson's team in the UPC preparations.
- Mr Maclean referred to the 'IPO as an Adaptive Organisation' article in the Executive Report as a major opportunity for the IPO and an excellent initiative. Ms Smyth said there had been a lot of enthusiasm for it and they were working towards enabling people. Mr Maclean said he would be happy to be involved in the initiative. Mr Alty said there was now a Leadership Forum which was adding value. Mr Gilbert said it would be good to meet the Senior Leadership Team.

Action

- **Mr Alty to let Steering Board know outcome of meeting with Chris Bryant, Shadow Culture Minister.**
- **Steering Board to meet Leadership Forum.**

6.2 BIS Update

6.2.1 Ms Feeny reported that the visit by Gareth Davies had been very positive. Towards the run up to the election, the main focus was on departments and managing ministerial involvement before purdah and media focus on electioneering from now until the end of March.

6.2.2 Strategic Work Programme: There was a big shift around policy and the need to talk to government. Because of the uncertainty of combinations, etc it would be difficult to manage the transition.

6.3 Finance and Performance Report

6.3.1 Mr Rogers reported that four ministerial targets had been delivered and the remaining targets were reporting as green. The average staff working days lost to sickness figure remained under 7. Also the financial position looked strong although there would be lots of expenditure towards year end.

6.3.2 Mr King reported that the end of December financial profile showed a considerable surplus. There were concerns about profiling a £4.5k deficit; however Mr King was confident about bringing this into line and breaking even. As far as expenditure was involved they had not recruited anyone – no IT specialists for IT Portfolio and rights granting areas. Ms Smyth said that an IT Recruitment Fair was being held on 29th January and hoped to recruit enough people from the event. Mr Alty said that they had agreed allowances that could be applied to attract candidates. Ms Smyth said the apprentices were doing very well and they were looking at getting in graduates to continue their experience.

6.3.3 Mr Austin asked whether the underspend on recruitment would have ramifications for the Pay Pilot and whether it might set off alarm bells in HM Treasury (HMT). Ms Smyth said they had met with HMT and they had not reacted badly and were content with the way the Pilot was working. Mr Alty said the Pay Pilot had been raised at the BIS DG meetings and they were interested: there could be an issue around the election which could tear it all up.

6.3.4 Mr Ecclestone referred to the Corporate Performance Report and said that the patent applications against renewals in the financial report did not line up. Mr King said he would investigate and get back to the meeting.

6.3.5 Mr Ecclestone asked whether the service from UKSBS was improving and stabilising. Ms Smyth said that in December pay there were very few mistakes. The mistakes that were made related to where IPO did not have full control of the whole process. Ms Smyth said they were in the process of trying to extend IPO controls. The four IPO staff were doing an excellent job. Unfortunately in January payroll there were issues with the overtime payments where SBS did not load the overtime file. A note went out to all IPO staff and any discrepancies in staff pay had been rectified immediately.

6.3.6 Mr Maclean said the Performance Report was in a good format. He noted that the directorate breakdown due to lower capitalisation was red. Mr King said that they would catch up at year end.

Action

- **Mr King to investigate financial report with reference to the patent applications against renewals.**

6.4 Risk Management

6.4.1 Ms Powell went through the changes to the Board Risk Register since November. She explained that one risk had been closed which referred to the changes to the website work with GDS where the effect was not as bad as first thought. The risk had now been moved to directorate level.

6.4.2 Ms Powell said there had been two new risks: the proposed move to Steria in April 2015 and EU copyright reform.

6.4.3 Mr Ecclestone said there were similar risks in both the Board and Operating Committee risk registers. Ms Powell said that the actions needed could be at different levels, eg one would have a 'doing' action and another one would have an 'oversight' action. Ms Smyth said that on the Operating Committee risk register an IT major incident risk had increased but the Board did not have time to take on the same level of interest so they had an oversight role.

7. STRATEGIC

7.1 Corporate Strategy Review

7.1.1 Mr Gilbert said that the Corporate Strategy Review and the Corporate Plan were both at an iterative stage. The Corporate Plan was more urgent as it had to be signed off by the Minister.

7.1.2 Five Year Strategy: Mr Haikney said that since the last Steering Board in November the strategic outcomes had been tested with the Minister. The Minister felt that the Vision was a bit academic and wordy and should be broken down and made simpler. Mr Haikney said he was currently working on the outcomes and would update everyone once finalised. Mr Haikney said there were other comments on the goals which the Minister was broadly content with, however she felt the enforcement work needed to be 'beefed up'. The Minister also felt education was not sufficiently represented and wanted it in a specific goal. At a Board meeting this was thought to be a good point, however it was hoped to incorporate education into the existing narrative as they agreed that they did not want more than six strategic goals.

7.1.3 Mr Haikney said they would be testing the Strategy with stakeholders after incorporating comments from the Minister and Steering Board in early March.

7.1.4 Mr Haikney explained that the strategy contained an introduction, then a purpose statement to headline the document. There was also a new addition which was 'Purpose and Approach' which drew themes together and was still a work in progress. The Strategic Goals and Outcomes would be a narrative piece summarising what the IPO would like to achieve and focussed on challenges and tensions to help us make choices.

7.1.5 Mr Haikney said the Strategy would be issued in early March or slightly earlier and before the election. He said he would share the narrative with Steering Board as it was developed.

7.1.6 Mr Gilbert asked whether the structure and content of the Strategy was going in the right direction. He noted the Minister's wish to get more involved in enforcement. Ms Lynch said they did not feel they were being pushed to do more on enforcement and that the Minister wanted them to promote what they were doing. She said all would be addressed in the strategy and would be clearer then.

7.1.7 Mr Suter said that education for businesses and consumers and users was a big issue and an area where the IPO had no powers to do anything about. Miss Wilkinson was also concerned that our stakeholders did not perceive the IPO as being open to fund their ideas. She reported that she would be meeting with creative stakeholders and said that the IPO was already doing a lot more on education than a few years ago and needed a mechanism for communicating what that was.

7.1.8 Mr Austin said the format of the Strategy was good and simple to follow and the context was good. He said it was not easy to follow in the Purpose, the sentence in the

fourth paragraph, ‘fundamentally the purpose of the IPO is to encourage continued investment ...’ as there was no reference to what we were doing. Mr Alty said it should read to promote or encourage. Mr Austin said that the IPO could do more promoting/encouraging on the investment side. Mr Feinson said that there was a risk of reading too much into it, ie investment means the way of promoting innovation and creativity. Miss Wilkinson said it allowed people to access finance to get innovation.

7.1.9 Mr Gilbert said he was not sure of the wording ‘fundamental purpose’. Mr Austin said he liked to know the idea of what is classed as investment and whether there was a way to show people where to go for investment.

7.1.10 Ms Nanayakkara said she was alarmed by mission creep and referred to infringing sites online and warned not to underestimate the power of the public sector. Challenging Google would be a tall order.

7.1.11 Ms Nanayakkara referred to the Purpose in the Strategy and said that there were good examples, eg Northern Ireland Police force which was a good way of breaking down the mission statement and could be included in elements of the work on the Purpose. She felt it was important to highlight IPO’s ethics and culture.

7.1.12 Mr Maclean said that the Minister wanted a simpler vision with priority given on using a conventional structure and asked whether they had they tried a different approach. Mr Feinson said that the Minister had not responded on the structure. Mr Alty said that the Minister had a view on what questions we should ask stakeholders.

7.1.13 Mr Maclean said he was content and when they saw the Purpose Statement everything would flow from it. The style of the document included a lot of detail and words, however the words were not engaging or exciting. Mr Ecclestone said that the process and the structure were good, however the context needed to be improved.

7.1.14 Mr Gilbert asked the NEDs to send any comments to Mr Haikney.

7.1.15 Mr Feinson said that the March document would be high level, enthusiastic, engaging and stimulating.

Action

- **NEDs to send comments on the Strategy to Mr Haikney.**

7.2 Corporate Plan

7.2.1 Mr Gilbert said that the Corporate Plan document was still in an iterative stage and there was lots more work to do before it goes to the Minister at the end of March. He said that BIS had won an award for best Annual Report last year and that it would be good if IPO could win an award for best Corporate Plan.

7.2.2 Ms Smyth asked for views on the slide pack to see if the right priorities and goals had been captured. She admitted that it was a long document and separate drafts had been pulled together with different styles. She said the Communications Plan would set out the People Strategy to help people understand how they fitted in. Ms Smyth also said there was a placeholder for ‘Vision and Purpose’.

7.2.3 Goal 1: Promoting UK growth through IP policy

- **Reforming the law on groundless threats:** Mr Dennehey explained that the Law Commission report made recommendations that Government should accept and that stakeholders would like.
- **Implementing the Unitary Patent:** Mr Dennehey said that they would need to work with European partners to agree on a renewal fee system.
- **Securing the right outcomes for the UK from the EU reform of copyright:** Ms Lynch said they were very much working hard to influence where the Commission was going and where our UK stakeholders felt comfortable. The Commission had not yet said what would be covered. Ms Lynch said this work would absorb them for the next couple of years.
- **Deliver global patent reform:** Mr Dennehey said they had been successful over the last couple of years, eg Patent Prosecution Highway and Mr Alty was trying to enable the B+ Group to move governments and industry sectors towards a position of agreement/convergence.

Mr Austin said that global patent reform was a long term big issue. Mr Dennehey said that on a number of fronts they were trying to advance towards global patent reform, some were small, but measured in terms of value to the business, was significant. Mr Alty said that it was a three-year plan and they would not get global patent reform by then. He said the goals were what they had picked out, however a new government might have different views.

Mr Maclean asked whether measures/evidence of what IPO had achieved could be provided. Mr Dennehey said there would be specifics of what we have done on global patent reform. Mr Maclean asked whether the measures would promote growth through IP policy. Mr Alty said there were outcomes and measures and that more work had been done on measures.

Mr Maclean asked whether IPO were being ambitious enough having the four objectives under Goal 1. Mr Alty said there may be some who thought that we should do more. He said Miss Wilkinson would be talking to No 10 about dormant patents which were not in the plan. Mr Alty was quite keen to focus on replacing an objective and not adding any.

7.2.4 Goal 2: Delivering high quality rights granting services

- **Transforming the IPO Digitally and Transforming Patent Services:** Mr Dennehey explained that Goal 2 had been split into two objectives. Mr Dennehey was the SRO for the TRIPOD (transferring the IPO digitally) Portfolio.

7.2.5 Goal 3: Ensuring IP Rights are respected and appropriately enforced

- **Speeding up the resolution of disputes:** Mr Dennehey said this objective was around the Trade Mark tribunals where they had carried out some very good work. It was important for SMEs that the IPO brought down the issuing of decisions from 15 months to 12 months. Some lawyers/attorneys might be in a position to swap representatives and could compromise the quality of justice/decisions. Mr Alty said that mediation was helping companies.
- **Reducing online IP infringement and the supply of counterfeit goods:** Ms Lynch explained that this objective was demonstrated very clearly by Police IP Crime Unit (PIPCU), which IPO was funding over the coming couple of years and changing the current government structure to help to reduce IP infringement.

Mr Gilbert said that the PIPCU wording was vague and asked whether it was measurable. Ms Lynch agreed to look at. Mr Gilbert asked whether the income from PIPCU belonged to IPO. Mr Alty said it was a significant and increasing part of IPO's work and it was up to them to agree with the new government a strategy with a clear role for us. Mr Suter said that if IPO were only funding, de facto IPO were the people responsible for what PIPCU did.

Action:

- **Ms Lynch to look at the wording of the PIPCU objective.**

7.2.6 Goal 4: Educating and enabling Business to understand, manage and protect their IP

- **Developing a Business Adviser Network:** Miss Wilkinson said the objective enabled longer term outreach activities and one of the ministerial targets was to catch 100,000 businesses.
- **Helping UK companies which are IP rich trade more internationally:** Mr Feinson said they were working on markets that were important outside the Attaché market.
- **Show that IP is a viable asset class for debt finance:** Miss Wilkinson said they would co-ordinate economic trials which would produce evidence to support the use of IP in debt finance.

Mr Austin asked Mr Feinson whether IPO was helping any other countries. Mr Feinson said that IPO was not UK generic. Miss Wilkinson said IP rich companies were more interested in export. Mr Alty explained that attachés do deal with casework and influence infrastructure in companies. Ms Nanayakkara said that increasing focus on devolution was not referred to. Miss Wilkinson said they made sure that they would reach companies at grass root level.

7.2.7 Goal 5: Improving the skills and capability of our people

- Ms Smyth reported that they were focussed on TRIPOD and building skills and capability of IPO staff. There was a very strong link with an adaptive organisation which would allow people to move around easily. She said Internal Communications had carried out a lot of work in talking about engagement and targeting various audiences. With Leadership and Change they were working on management and strong leadership capability and managing change. Ms Smyth said there was continuous improvement, but had not been embedded and they needed to continue.

- Paybill Pilot: Mr Feinson was diversity champion and would be reviewing working priorities which would come out of the TRIPOD work.

Mr Austin said that the descriptions of Lean and Leadership and Managing Change could be improved.

7.2.8 Goal 6: Increasing efficiency and delivering value for money

- **Implementing fee changes:** Mr King explained that the objective was a two stage project: what did we want to consult, and the consultation and implementation on 1 April.
- **Transferring the IPO finance system to a shared solution with Companies House:** Mr King wanted to make Steering Board aware that the transferring of the finance system was a shared solution and not a shared service given the bad reputation with shared services. By using Companies House there would be a stepping stone to a lot of improvements, eg rewriting Chart of Accounts, forecasting, reconciliations, etc. Mr King said there had been a lot of interest in what IPO was doing from other partner organisations. Mr Alty said that Mr Davies had been very interested in shared solutions when he visited the Office.
- **Virtualising our IT network:** Mr Feldman said they were moving more into cloud space so there would be no physical networks and making IPO less reliant on hardware and network providers.

7.2.9 Ministerial Targets

- Mr Gilbert asked whether the ministerial targets had been challenged by the Minister. Mr Alty explained that some were 'run the business' targets, others were time specific, eg Unitary Patent Court which was challenging and the Patent Hub picked up education with a new formulation of reaching out to business. With skills and capability this had been debated about and this year there was quite a tick-box exercise in completing training programmes which we would not be continuing because people ought to be progressing from the training. Specifically we should identify changes over the coming years to what it means. Mr Alty said that two financial targets were rolled forward from last year. Mr Alty said we should let the Minister have sight of the ministerial targets to give her time.
- Mr Austin said that Miss Wilkinson's target of reaching 100,000 businesses with IP messages was an input and not an output. Miss Wilkinson agreed it was not very well phrased as it was about business using the tools and would look at the wording.

7.2.10 Mr Maclean said he liked the A3 diagram in the Plan, but the document was a big read and felt it was not better than last year's Plan and asked what audience it was aimed for. Mr Alty said that they would produce different versions of the Corporate Plan and flyers. Ms Smyth said there was a need to set things out in detail to get the depth of thinking.

7.2.11 Mr Gilbert said that this year's document was a better document, but there was still work to do. Mr Alty said they had reflected Steering Board's views from last year and had circulated the document earlier to get views.

7.2.12 Mr Gilbert asked Steering Board to email any comments on the 2015-2018 Corporate Plan document to Mr Walkden and Ms Smyth.

Action:

- **Miss Wilkinson to revise the wording of the ‘reaching an audience of at least 100,000 businesses’ ministerial target.**
- **NEDs to email comments on the 2015-2018 Corporate Plan document to Mr Walkden and Ms Smyth.**

7.3 Corporate Plan: Finance and Budget

7.3.1 Mr Gilbert said that looking at the finances in detail, he did not approve of a business plan with deficit financing.

7.3.2 Mr King explained that the budget situation was moving and changing on a daily basis. He explained the process involved in putting budgets together. Initial budget submissions from each directorate were submitted to provide the overall picture. Mr Alty and each Director had gone through their submission to understand what they wanted to achieve and the make-up of the budgets. A lot of checking was done for double counting and there was a lot of discussion on the approach to capitalisation.

7.3.3 Mr King said he was happy with the demand and income budget. He said there was an upward trend in respect to patent and trade marks income and they were back into getting renewal income with a shift up to £6.2m. There had been an income drop due to rental income.

7.3.4 Mr King reported that the Fees Review was underway, however the budgets did not take into account any fees increase. With regard to expenditure, staff numbers were a key driver and because the Pay Pilot period ran from August to July, they had provided an 18 month forecast.

7.3.5 Mr King said that no account had been taken for any reduction in numbers due to increased digitalisation. Employers increased pension contributions from 1 April had been included in the budgets as well as a 4% attrition rate.

7.3.6 Mr King said there was other expenditure totalling £43k and discussions were ongoing with regards as to whether to stop or defer, ie WBW and increase capitalisation. He said he was also looking to BIS to make payments on IPO's behalf as a special dividend which they would use to pay for the re-fit of the Unified Patent Court and that cost could then be taken off the operating account.

7.3.7 Mr King said the TRIPOD portfolio budgeting had been split between current costs and the capital element which he thought was a more prudent approach and was awaiting sign-off from NAO.

7.3.8 Mr King explained that outreach and education were also big ticket items as well as facilities. Heating and windows expenditure were an ongoing problem but could be capitalised.

7.3.9 Mr King said the overall position as at 22 January 2015 was £7.6m deficit. £4.9m was for UPC with the latest refurbishment costing £2.7m. As long as BIS pay via a special dividend, this amount would be taken out.

7.3.10 Mr King explained that there would be more decisions that the Executive Board would need to take, but he was confident that they would break even. The next stage would

be to run through the implications, one big cost being the running costs for the UPC, £2-3m per year.

7.3.11 Mr Gilbert said he was concerned that with the IPO money reserves, they were not being seen as a soft touch. He said there was a big chance of a deficit in the first year which would be difficult. Business as usual was being run as efficiently as possible and all exceptional items should be stripped back and UPC taken out. Mr Gilbert said he would feel more comfortable with this and would like to see the financial position of break even plus £1m. Mr King said he was putting options together to get to a £1m surplus.

7.3.12 Mr Austin noted the healthy growth in searches, etc and said the IPO was not cost recovering and the Fees Review would allow us to have a debate about whether we have got that right. Mr Austin said the staffing levels from April 2017 flat lined and asked whether the Executive Board were happy with that.

7.3.13 Mr Dennehey said that income was very much weighted towards renewals and the prioritisation of work carrying out searches. He said the number of people flat line in April 2017 because it was beyond the current planning horizon.

7.3.14 Mr Maclean said that presentationally the IPO was running at a deficit. Mr Alty said there was a five year period to break even. Debts in year 1, 2, 3 and 4 and then year 5 to recover. He said they would explore the consequences of the different options, however if the windows refurbishment was deferred, they would probably end up paying more for them. Mr Gilbert said that the WBW programme should not be deferred as it was important for staff morale.

7.3.15 Mr Maclean said that IPO could increase its income with a fee increase from 1 April 2016. Mr Dennehey said that a new government would not like to put fees up for businesses and that Mr King had taken the right approach in not including an increase in the budgets.

7.3.16 Mr Alty said they had discussed prioritisation and agreed to not have a scoring matrix. He said they would have to prey to the Minister to say what was most important.

7.4 Digital Vision Update

7.4.1 Mr Dennehey said that in regard to the Digital Vision update it was not sensible to bring a revision paper to Steering Board without having been seen by the Chief Technology Officer. At the awayday it was discussed about having a Vision and open-ended discussions have taken place at TCC and IPOB meetings. They drew on the Companies House Digital Strategy and Ms Nanayakkara commented on and fed into the discussions.

Action:

- **Mr Dennehey to have discussion about Digital Vision with Mr Feldman and update the meeting.**

7.5 Funding Model/Fees Review Update

7.5.1 Mr Gilbert noted the Funding Model/Fees Review Update and recognised the main area of concern was the reliance on income from the European Patent Office (EPO). He said that OHIM was a potential income line and asked whether the Steering Board could have an update.

7.5.2 Mr Maclean said the second part of the paper was not an income generating exercise and asked how it sat with Managing Public Money which stated they should be charging fees to recover all costs. Mr Maclean asked whether this should be reflected in the paper. Mr

King said the driver was change and behaviour. Mr Dennehey said that Managing Public Money was about recovery over the length of the service.

Action:

- **Mr King to provide Steering Board with an update on OHIM potential income line.**

7.6 SB Effectiveness Review: Raising the Profile of NEDs

7.6.1 Mr Gilbert said he had discussed the paper in a conference call with the NEDs where they had agreed with the recommendations.

8 TOPICAL

8.1 People Survey 2014 Corporate Action Plan

8.1.1 Ms Smyth explained that the People Survey had been discussed at the last Steering Board meeting. She reported a 2% increase from last year in the overall engagement score to 60% which was very good. An Action Plan focussing on organisational objectives and purpose and leadership and managing change had been discussed at executive board.

8.1.2 Mr Maclean said that the graph was very useful and asked what the IPO had to do to get to the top 10 ranking of all government departments – what were the top 10 achieving and what lessons could IPO learn.

8.1.3 Ms Smyth said that the ‘Mission to America’ was a good example of looking at other organisations and would like to look at other organisations. Mr Alty said he attended cross-government meetings where engaging professional staff had been discussed and there were some interesting ideas and common challenges.

8.2 IT Roadmap Update

8.2.1 Mr Feldman said that good progress was being made and projects were moving forward. MyIPO was now into the next stage. The IT Strategy adopted was the right strategy with the right choices on technology. He said there was a lot of reliance on GDS and a lot of time was spent getting approvals and they were looking at ways of speeding the process up.

8.2.2 Mr Feldman reported that the organisational structure had been outlined to the IT Team and they would make tweaks over time. He said there were areas where the balance of people was unusual which may be looked at. The ability to recruit people in South Wales to make TRIPOD a success was one of the biggest risks in the Programme.

8.2.3 Mr Feldman said that outside TRIPOD, government security applied was unusual and there were opportunities to ask questions. He said he was very impressed with the progress made so far and they were moving in the right direction.

8.2.4 Mr Gilbert said they would like an update at the next Steering Board meeting.

8.2.5 Mr Alty thanked Mr Taylor for all his work on IT Strategy and Roadmap.

Action

- **Mr Feldman to give Steering Board an update on the IT Strategy and Roadmap at the next meeting.**

8.3 Non Executive Directors – Round Table Update

8.3.1 Due to time restraints this item was postponed and would be discussed at a private meeting.

9 INFORMATION

9.1 SB Effectiveness Review Action Update

9.1.1 Mr Gilbert said the note on “how we work” could be adopted.

9.1.2 With regards to Recommendation 8, Mr Gilbert felt that NEDs posting short video clips did not really work last time and was not sure it was very successful. It was also a lot of commitment and suggested a different way of posting news to staff, eg blogs.

9.1.3 With reference to bringing an external member with financial expertise to Audit Committee, Mr Gilbert said that as the IPO were merging finance systems with Companies House, it might be appropriate to bring in a Non Executive from Companies House to Audit Committee. Mr Austin thought the person could be an Official and not a Non Executive.

9.1.4 Mr Maclean said that the recent NED development training provided by BIS had not been particularly beneficial and would feedback to the Steering Board. Ms Nanayakkara said there had not been any follow up to the training.

Action

- **Mr Alty, Mr Austin, Mr King and Ms Smyth to discuss a further member of the Audit Committee with financial expertise.**

9.2 EU Copyright: UK vision for the EU’s digital economy

9.2.1 Ms Lynch referred to the UK vision paper which had come from No 10. She said that the creative industries were angry that they were not included in the paper. Ms Lynch said the paper had not been favourable both in the UK and Europe.

10 Any other Business

10.1 There was no any other business.

Date of Next Meeting: 31 March 2015