

**Minutes of the APHA Executive Board Meeting
Wednesday, 27th July 2016, Committee Rm 4, Manchester Town Hall.
Commencing at 12.00hrs**

EB 16/16 List of Attendees		Person Responsible
<p>List of Attendees: Pat McCarthy Cllr John Warman Cllr Adrian Brocklehurst Cllr Jeffrey Dudgeon Cllr Ged Bell</p> <p>Authority Associate Member of APHA, Chair Swansea Bay Port Health Authority, Vice Chair Manchester Port Health Authority City of Belfast, Belfast Port Health Authority North Tyneside Port Health Authority</p>		<p>PMc JW AB JD GB</p>
<p>Overview & Scrutiny Cttee Cllr Keith Morley</p> <p>Operational Board Gill Morgan</p> <p>In attendance Gary Gould</p> <p>Minutes taken by: GG</p>	<p>Manchester PHA, Chair</p> <p>Swansea Bay PHA</p> <p>BIO</p>	<p>KM</p> <p>GM</p> <p>GG</p>
EB 16/17 Apologies for Absence		Person Responsible
<p>Cllr David Carr Brian Lawrie Val Cameron</p>	<p>Medway and Chatham Port Health Authority South Ayrshire Council States of Guernsey</p>	
EB 16/18.a Minutes of Previous meeting held on the 20th April 2016		Person Responsible
<p>Prior to proceedings, the Chair welcomed everyone to what was expected to be an important meeting of the Executive Board with regards to securing the future of the Association. He then confirmed that, following the e-mail consultation; Gill Morgan had been co-opted to the Executive Board in order to fill one of the "casual vacancies". GB pointed out that he was relatively new to the EB and did not know everyone in attendance. The Chair then asked everyone to introduce themselves.</p> <p>Accuracy</p> <p>There was some discussion with regards Laurie Dettman's comments with regards to dissolving the Association not being recorded in the minutes. It was accepted that whilst dissolving the Association was mentioned, it was not tabled as a formal proposal and that LD drew back from the suggestion.</p> <p>AB hi-lighted that 16/10 1 did not reflect, accurately, what had been agreed in that the BIOGG could only expect Admin Support from Manchester until the end of September 2016. With this amendment, the minutes were accepted as a true record.</p> <p>Proposed: KM; Seconded: GM</p>		
EB 16/18.b Matters arising from the Minutes not in Agenda		Person Responsible
<p>EB 16/14: GG had taken it upon himself to contact Carwyn Thomas at Milford PHA with regards to the 'post SIMS' database. Carwyn was on leave but will be contacted on his return. The website details have been forwarded to the Webmaster but there are issues with regards to subscribing, so he is unable to access in order to carry out an evaluation. These issues should be resolved when Carwyn returns from leave.</p>		GG

<p>JW then raised the issue of Bill Arnold’s retirement. He said that the sterling work and dedicated service to APHA by Bill should be recognised and that at the very least, a letter of thanks should be sent. The Chair replied that he had already been thanked. KM mentioned that he had been thanked and presented with a tie at the last O&S meeting but the general consensus was that there should be something further. Notwithstanding that he has indicated his intention to retire fully, it was proposed that he should be awarded with a Honorary Fellowship.</p> <p>Proposed: JW; Seconded: JD</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;">AGREED ALL</p> <p>EB 16/19 Minutes of Overview & Scrutiny Committee Meeting</p>	<p>Person Responsible</p>
<p>The minutes were considered and, with the exception of the following, it was agreed that the rest of the items were already on the agenda.</p> <p>O&S 16/17 This item related to EB 16/13 APHA Conference 2015 and the report that had been written by John Robinson (JR) entitled <i>Official Report from the 2015 Conference</i>. GG outlined the concerns that he had raised with the O&S Committee regarding the inaccurate way his involvement had been portrayed despite the fact that he had co-operated fully with JR when he was investigating compiling the report. The O&S Committee had recommended that the report be either amended or withdrawn.</p> <p>GB expressed concern that JR was not present to answer the issues raised by O&S. The Chair then explained that JR had submitted his resignation as Acting Company Secretary, Director and member of the Executive Board in May.</p> <p>AB said that he accepted GB’s point and went on the add that: JR had produced the report under commission from APHA but JR’s report has not been tabled at an APHA meeting for scrutiny by the APHA Executive Board (EB); it is entirely appropriate for GG to challenge statements in JR’s report relating to GG’s actions, competence and personal integrity particularly given GG’s recent appointment as BIO; GG’s statement to the O&S committee as recorded in the minutes is GG’s personal response submitted to O&S at a time when GG was a full member of the O&S committee and JR was not present to respond; and JR is not present at this EB meeting to defend his position. In AB’s view the way forward is to either arrange for an independent review of the report and its findings with the people referred to in the O&S minute available for interview or, given the concern already expressed at this EB meeting about the backward looking and potentially divisive nature of this discussion, this item should not be proceeded with because the report in question has not been tabled. JW responded by pointing out that, in considering this, the EB was going over old ground and that we should move forward. GG said that he would be content for it to be documented that the report was not accepted by the EB. KM confirmed that it was a report in isolation on what JR’s thoughts were of what went wrong with the Conference. GB suggested that, from an outside perspective, APHA cannot move on and suggested an independent review to include an audit of the 2015 conference accounts. PM replied that he was content to <i>throw open the books</i> to any investigation/audit.</p> <p>At this point GB indicated that he had attended the meeting with instructions from North Tyneside Joint Committee to give notice that they would not be renewing membership next year and that he would be resigning from the EB with immediate effect. GM suggested that GB remain, continue to attend and be engaged. GB replied that these issues need to be discussed and resolved and that his presence would hinder that discussion so it would be more beneficial if he left. At this point GB left the meeting.</p> <p>JW proposed that the <i>Official Report from the 2015 Conference</i> should have no standing; Seconded: GM</p> <p>It was agreed unanimously that, because the report was neither tabled to, nor accepted by, the Executive Board, it had no official standing.</p>	

EB16/20 APHA Administration	Person Responsible
<p>The Chair read out the contents of JR's resignation letter (copy attached); his resignation was accepted by the EB. As part of the resignation JR gave notice that Manchester PHA would withdraw Administration and Finance support but in order to facilitate a transfer of responsibility, they would continue in this role until the end of September 2016. AB confirmed that it did not mean Manchester would <i>pull the plug</i> if arrangements were not in place but it was to give APHA a time line in which to source an alternative. It was important to protect the livelihood of those persons who depend on APHA.</p> <p>The Chair thanked AB for clarifying the position and informed the EB that he has been forced to assume the role of Acting Company Secretary whilst a replacement is sought. He then asked if anyone attending the meeting would be prepared to take on the role. There were no takers.</p> <p>AB asked whether JR was still a Director of APHA and recognised as such at Companies House. The Chair confirmed that acceptance of his resignation removed JR as a Director but that Companies House would need to be notified. He then tasked GG to investigate. The Chair advised the Board that he was making enquiries with the <i>South Belfast Partnership Board</i> with a view to them taking over the Admin and Accounts. JD suggested that APHA investigate the possibility of a Private Company being appointed to undertake the role. It was agreed that, whilst it could be a possibility, the preference was for APHA Accounts and Admin to reside within the governance of LA control. AB confirmed that Salford City Council would continue to undertake the financial validation work whilst Manchester PHA administered the accounts.</p>	GG/ PMc/
EB16/21 APHA Financial Report, Accounts and Membership Renewal	Person Responsible
<p>GG reported that as of 26 June 2016 there was £66,017.65 in the account. The bookkeeper had kindly created a spreadsheet with projected outgoings included and APHA is currently on track to end the year with a positive balance of £35942.72. However, Administration costs are only projected until the end of September, it does not include any expenditure on the AGM and there remain the ShipSan issues to resolve. These will probably have an impact on the final balance. It was agreed that the projected expenditure should be <i>fleshed out</i> to the end of the FY so that the EB have a better understanding of the financial position at the next meeting.</p> <p>Membership renewals stood at 16 Corporate, 4 PlaN and 2 Associate. There remains 14 Corporate and 1 Associate outstanding. GG will be attempting to contact the late payers with a view to securing their continuing membership.</p>	GG GG
EB16/22 Webmaster	Person Responsible
<p>PM questioned whether the cost of the contract that APHA has with the Webmaster was justified in light of the tight financial position.</p> <p>GG briefed the EB on a meeting held with the Webmaster on the 26 July 2016 when they went through, in some detail, the maintenance that website requires. With 77 pages, different levels of access and a forum, the website is not just a simple "splash" page. Add to that the security, back up and software updates, GG believed that the current contract was fully justified. GG explained that APHA received a discount of 1/3 on the Webmaster's hourly rate because he has guaranteed hours and that his normal hourly rate undercut the market average. However, whilst the webmaster undertakes the routine maintenance and back-up functions without instruction, the EB should not expect him to update and post articles/information on his own initiative because he is not a Port Health Officer and therefore requires direction. That said and looking to the future, APHA has only utilised some of the Webmaster IT skills and capabilities, he is able to develop such things as an on-line magazine, webinars, stream meetings and, if provided with the content, on-line training. In light of this GG recommended strongly that the EB make no change to the current arrangements.</p>	

<p>Agreed.</p> <p>JW mentioned that he was having password problems and could not access the members area. He was advised that he should receive a message to contact APHA Admin if a log in attempt failed but GG would take the matter up with the webmaster.</p> <p>There followed some discussion about the <i>rogue</i> websites and the status of the Nominet appeal to have them removed. GG explained that he did review the status of the appeal during his meeting with the Webmaster. Again it is not a straightforward process in that the case must be argued thoroughly and evidence provided. The Webmaster utilises any time left of his contracted hours on this task. There are 2 appeals; one is practically ready for submission whilst the other requires approximately 8 hours work; they should both be submitted together. It was agreed that the work on the appeal should be continued.</p> <p>The Chair re-affirmed that APHA cannot exist on subscriptions alone and was considering other methods to secure funding. JW suggested meeting with MP or write to the relevant minister. The problem is which minister as the work Port Health Officers are engaged in crosses several ministerial departments and it was suggested that it would be better to make an approach through the civil service staff</p>	<p>GG</p> <p>Webmaster</p>
<p>EB16/23 Task and Finish Group (T&F Gp) Action Plan</p>	<p>Person Responsible</p>
<p>GG introduced the Action Plan that the T&F Gp had developed and asked the EB to empower the Gp to implement it.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>T&F Gp</p>
<p>EB16/24 AGM</p>	<p>Person Responsible</p>
<p>With the cancellation of the Conference this year, the EB were required to agree a date to hold the AGM. It is a legal requirement to hold an AGM and the articles require it to be held within 15 months of the last. The benefits of holding a workshop/training event at the same time as a means of attracting lapsed/new members was debated, it was felt that a workshop to determine what lapsed members required would be covering old ground and that it was time to start delivering on the training need. There was also discussion regarding the accounts and the auditing thereof. KM stated that Halton Borough Council were the auditors</p> <p>The following was agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In accordance with the T&F Gp action Plan to hold the AGM together with a low cost training event. To facilitate ease of travel for the maximum number of attendees, the venue should be in London. 2. To approach the Union Jack Club for room availability in November 2016 with the 4th as a proposed date. 3. AB agreed to approach Salford City Council to confirm that the accounts would be validated for the AGM and whether they would require auditing. <p>Secretary's note: KM approached the UJC and there being no room availability for 4th November, the Gascoigne Suite was booked for 30 November 2016.</p> <p>GM briefed the EB on the Ship Inspection training that the Port Health SIG had rolled out. The new version was good and, but with the change to LA's structure in some cases Port Health had been subsumed into other departments such as Food. Together with austerity, this means that it is too expensive to deliver such training centrally and that it was better to regionalise. Such training could be delivered through the PLaN groups and encourage LA's to become PLaN members.</p>	<p>T&F Gp</p> <p>KM</p> <p>AB</p>
<p>EB16/25 Operational Board</p>	<p>Person Responsible</p>

<p>.GM briefed the EB on the current status of the Operational Board (OB). There had been no meetings since the last EB because they were waiting on the report of the T&F Gp and approval by the EB of the Action Plan. As this had now been agreed the OB would engage with T&F Gp to implement the plan.</p> <p>It was agreed that GM would represent the OB at the next T&F Gp meeting, scheduled to be held with the next O&S Committee meeting on 17 August 2016.</p>	GM
<p>EB16/26 National Environmental Health Board</p>	Person Responsible
<p>GG drew the EB's attention to his report on the last NEHB Meeting (copy attached) and the official notes. He reiterated that representation at this meeting should be at Senior management level within the LA setting. However, it is important that someone should attend from APHA and in the absence of anyone else coming forward he would continue to attend.</p>	GG
<p>EB16/27 PHE FW&E Microbiology Services Reconfiguration Board</p>	Person Responsible
<p>KM briefed the EB on the circumstances of how he came to attend the Reconfiguration Board meeting in that it was a <i>last minute</i> action and no one else was available. The meeting comprised stakeholders who would be affected by the reduction of PHE laboratories from 5 to 3 and KM was the only attendee who was not an officer but it was important for APHA to be represented. Future meetings would be by monthly teleconference, in the main, on the 1st of the month.</p> <p>It was agreed that GG would represent APHA at future meetings.</p>	GG
<p>EB16/28 Any Other Business</p>	Person Responsible
<p>The following items were raised:</p> <p>1. ShipSan: GG briefed the EB on the situation with regards to APHAs legacy problems with ShipSan. He had managed to make contact with Karen White who had agreed to return the Shipsan laptop provided that her final invoice was paid but she was adamant that she did not have the printer. A recent e-mail from the Financial Department of ShipSan had presented APHA with 2 options to settle this issue. The first, cheaper option, involves submitting paperwork that APHA does not have currently but may be on the laptop. The second, more expensive, accepts that we cannot submit the paperwork. Both options require APHA to withdraw from further work. It was estimated that the maximum liability on APHA would be approximately 10,000 Euro (approx £8500) but this would be offset by the £5000+ retrieved from CIEH for ShipSan work that was not undertaken. The e-mail from the Financial department also made it clear that APHA could send 2 representatives from APHA to the final ShipSan conference at the end of September and that their expenses could be offset against the money to be repaid. Andrea Smith (ShipSan Rep) had already been authorised to accept the invitation</p> <p>It was agreed that:</p> <p>a. GG should visit Falmouth to retrieve the Shipsan Laptop to facilitate the payment of Karen White's final invoice.</p> <p>b. Whilst the first, cheaper option, is preferred, the EB accepts that it is unlikely that the information/paperwork required will be found on the laptop. In which case the second option would be authorised.</p> <p>c. GG should attend the final ShipSan conference at the end of September.</p> <p>2. Name Change: GM suggested that the change of name proposed by Laurence Dettman to stop the confusion caused by the Animal & Plant Health Agency using our acronym should be adopted and launched at the AGM. In discussion it was agreed that a name change could</p>	<p>GG</p> <p>PM</p> <p>GG</p> <p>T&F Gp</p>

<p>be pursued but should be part of a root and branch reform the outcome of which would require approval at the AGM. The re-launch could coincide with next years subscription renewal.</p>	
<p>3. PLaN Funding Protocol: GM highlighted that whilst it had been agreed that PlaN Groups could access funds to support meetings and training, it was not clear how they went about claiming it. It was agreed that a protocol should be produced to inform PlaN groups about the procedure.</p>	GG
<p>EB16/29 Date of next meeting</p>	
<p>As there was no conference scheduled for this year, it was agreed that the date of the next meeting should be on 21 September 2016, time to be determined. KM to approach the UJC in order to facilitate the meeting.</p>	KM
<p>The meeting closed at 15:30</p>	



Manchester Port Health Authority

Dutton House
46 Church Street
RUNCORN
Cheshire
WA7 1LL

Tel: 01928 572919

Fax: 01928 581596

Email: Porthealth@manchesterpha.org.uk

www.manchesterpha.org.uk

11 May 2016

Fao: Mr Pat McCarthy
25 Cooke Street
Belfast
BT7 2EP

Dear Pat

Resignation of the APHA Administration Team

Thank you for coming to my home last Friday, the 6 May 2016 for a discussion on APHA and the future.

As a result of those very frank discussions, please accept this letter as my formal resignation as Acting Company Secretary and Director of APHA.

There is no reason to go into detail to explain my decision I would welcome a swift conclusion, rather than a protracted period which would be appreciated. In addition to my decision, the APHA Administration Team also want to cease to undertake the administration and finance duties they have been fulfilling since October 2014, at the same time.

During the time Manchester has been undertaking the financial arrangements of APHA, there has been a number of challenges to the financial arrangements that we created. This had made it very difficult for us to continue to work for APHA.

Following on from the previous APHA Executive meeting on 20 April 2016, HSBC signatory forms were passed on relieving Yvonne Graham and Andrea Smith from being signatories from the business bank account. Two more signatories must present their identification to a HSBC bank along with those forms by Wednesday 18 May 2016, from then on neither ladies will be responsible from paying any further bills for APHA, and neither will I be responsible for the authorising of payments.

In conclusion, I think APHA is now in better financial and administration shape than at any time in the last decade and I sincerely hope the Operational Procedures and methods of working are adhered too, by our successors.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "John Robinson".

John Robinson
Chief Port Health Officer
Manchester Port Health Authority

National Environmental Health Board (NEHB) Meeting – 24th May 2016

At the request of the Acting Company Secretary, G Gould attended the subject meeting on behalf of APHA.

The following were discussed but it should be noted that the notes are based on the author's interpretation. Formal notes will be produced by Sharon Smith (CIEH Network manager and Board co-ordinator) in due course:

1. **The Red Tape Review** - Originating from the Cabinet Office, the review was to investigate unnecessary regulatory barriers to growth placed on businesses by Local Authorities. The CIEH consulted with the membership and provided a detailed response. This was subsequently followed by a set of questions which, despite the short deadline, the CIEH managed to consult and respond. Contributions from a Port Health perspective on this consultation were provided by members of the SIG although it is possible that individual Port Health Authorities may have contributed individually. It was generally believed that the Treasury was behind the review with the principle driver being to save money from regulation and move to a licensing and intelligence led delivery. There was concern that the Government did not understand that Councils did in fact want business to thrive.

It was questioned whether the insurers were involved but the answer was not as far as was known; it was contended that if regulation was reduced or removed, insurance premiums would go up.

There was no doubt that the review could have a significant impact on the Environmental Health Profession and there was consensus in that Environmental health should be clear about their purpose. Listening was key and EHPs should consider moving into dealing with non-disease causes of death e.g. obesity.

2. **Environmental Health Policy Forum (EHPF) and NEHB** – There was concern regarding the overlap and potential duplication of effort between the EHPF and NEHB. It was noted that key members of the EHPF did originally attend the NEHB meetings but were not present. The need for the EHPF to exist was questioned and it was stated that the LGA had reduced their support to the EHPF and, perhaps, would like to see it "gone". Following discussion it was believed that the NEHB should focus on leadership and the strategic and leave the operational/tactical to EHPF with a tie in to the Chief Officer and EH Manager groups. It was then suggested that the TORs be reviewed to re-focus. Sharon Smith said she was content to review and change ToRs and develop a strategic action plan.

3. **Health and Safety Competencies**- This was led by Alex Tsavolos from the HSE LA Unit who delivered a presentation based on the strategy *Helping Britain Work Well*. For the future HSE would like Flexibility, joined up working, efficiency, risk based and professional. In effect working together, sharing good ideas and the load. Introduce new technology and ways of working e.g. social media for targeting. The biggest area of concern was the perceived lack of competency amongst LA enforcement. There was no surprise at this because of the direction to reduce interventions; the lack of practise would erode competency. They will be approaching enforcement officers to gather views on competency in order to formulate an action plan.

4. **Apprenticeships** – Ten years of attempts under previous rules but proposals could not go forward; however, under the 2015 Trail Blazer Scheme, 10 or more employers can form a consortium and establish a scheme. There is one definite scheme for Environmental health submitted covering both EH and Public Health by the South West Regional Forum (SWRF) although it accepted it will be national. There is competition from RD who are proposing a Regulatory Services Apprentice. Under current rules one submission should lock out any further proposals provided the rules are followed so the SWRF scheme should block RD but this may not

be the case. RD arguing that theirs is different. CIEH would prefer both schemes to be brought together as one but at present they are polarised. CIEH are supporting the SWRF scheme in any event but accept that the situation is a bit "murkey". The message was to "Watch this space".

G Gould

G GOULD
On behalf of
APHA