

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF JERSEY BUSINESS LIMITED ("JBL")**

**(30<sup>th</sup> Meeting)**

**6<sup>th</sup> July 2016 at 11am**

- Present:** Mrs W Lambert, (WL) (Chair)  
Mr B Sarre (BS)  
Mr J Box (JB)  
Mr G Smith (GS)  
Mr J Day (JD)  
Mr E Lincoln (EL)  
Mrs K Le Feuvre (KLF)  
(the "Directors" )
- In Attendance:** Miss A Maskell (AM), AM to PM Secretarial Services (AM) (until 12.15pm only)  
Mrs A McClure (AMc), Jersey Business Limited (for item 8 only)
- 1. Apologies** Apologies were noted from Andrew Sugden (AS).
- 2. Chairperson** **IT WAS RESOLVED** to appoint WL chairperson of the meeting.
- 3. Declarations of Interest** There were no additional declarations of interest.
- 4. Minutes of previous meeting** **IT WAS NOTED** that the previous A and B minutes dated 25<sup>th</sup> May 2016 had been circulated with the agenda and **IT WAS RESOLVED** to approve the B minutes for WL's signature. However, a number of amendments were noted on the A minutes. **IT WAS THEREFORE RESOLVED** that AM would prepare a revised version for WL's signature.
- GS took the Board through the action points (which were not included on the agenda) from the previous meeting dated 25<sup>th</sup> May 2016 as follows:
- (a) **Video initiative analysis** – GS confirmed that these had been circulated as part of the Facebook data. He noted that the initiative had been very cost effective; that positive feedback had been received on it; and that it was proposed to continue with this initiative.
- (b) **JBL's application to the Economic and Productivity Growth Drawdown Provision Fund (EPGDPF)** – GS confirmed that he had provided KLF and JD with a copy of this.
- (c) **Eventbrite Cancellation of Digital Jersey/JBL Enterprise Week Event** – GS explained that, in order to initiate a survey of those present at the event, AMc was required to cancel JD and KLF's bookings through Eventbrite (as they were not present).
- (d) **E-Spark** – GS confirmed that a follow up meeting is scheduled for 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016 with the Head of Retail and Business Banking at RBSI to further discuss engagement between JBL, RBSI and e-Spark. **IT WAS THEREFORE RESOLVED** that he would provide the Board with an update thereafter.

(e) **Programme Updates** – GS confirmed that these are now included in the Board Pack on a quarterly basis and stored in Sharepoint.

(f) **Board Evaluation** – GS noted that this is on hold pending receipt of BDO's report following its internal audit review.

(g) **Quarterly “soundbyte” of JBL’s key themes** – GS advised that this has been delayed due to his recent holiday. However, he proposed including this as a future agenda item going forward so that the Directors can also provide an update on key themes from their respective sectors and this was welcomed by the Board.

BS requested that ideally this should also include a case study of one of the clients we have worked with. A discussion then ensued re client confidentiality after which it was agreed that either GS would see if we could organise a short presentation with one of the JBL clients subject of course to their approval

**Air Conditioning** – GS reported that the resolution of this was on-going.

**General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)** – JB reported that the GDPR has come into effect in Europe since the last meeting and **IT WAS RESOLVED** that he would circulate a link to the Board on the same.

**Cyber Security/Disaster Recovery** – GS reported and he has met with JB to discuss cyber security, disaster recovery and business continuity and **IT WAS RESOLVED** that he would put an appropriate policy together for JB's review with a view to discussing it with the Board's thereafter.

5. **Economic and Productivity Growth Drawdown Provision Fund (EPGDPF)**

As noted above, a response has not yet been received on JBL's bid for funding from the EPGDPF. The bid made to EPGDPF by the Retail Development Group (RDG) (with which JBL assisted) was briefly discussed.

6. **4Insight Feedback Process on Awards for Enterprise**

The number of respondents was felt to be low and GS acknowledged that this was disappointing, noting that only 40 people had taken part but stressed that it was necessary to undertake the research in the limited time available.

WL proposed a round table discussion in order for everyone to provide their views on the A4E.

GS suggested that from “Jersey Plc” perspective there was value in having an awards ceremony to represent the best businesses across all sectors. However, from a JBL perspective, he stressed that the A4E is not a core activity. He felt that JBL should not continue to underwrite an event of this nature. That said, if a reason can be found which indicates that the event is important enough for “Jersey Plc”, possibly via the Economic and Productivity Growth Drawdown Provision Fund (EPGDPF) then he believes JBL should work with those clients who wish to go through the process due to the value it provides them. Whilst GS does not anticipate that government will be prepared to underwrite the event, he would support a further approach to them for funding but he would not support JBL continuing to carry the event as a JBL profit and loss risk.

AMc suggested that whilst JBL's involvement in business excellence via the A4E was a positive thing, this could be done in other ways. She noted that there are numerous awards ceremonies in Jersey (e.g. IOD, CIM, JCC etc.) and therefore if A4E continues it must be different or stand out in some way. She acknowledged that whilst the history of the A4E may make them different, she was unsure whether this was enough. She reassured the Board that operationally JBL can deliver whatever is required based on the budget it receives. However, she highlighted that organisation of the A4E does take a considerable amount of time and effort. AMc suggested that JBL are the best placed body to organise the event if it has the budget. However, she stressed the importance of having the appropriate resource and budget in place to achieve this.

AMc advised that the A4E was a six month project which takes up between 15% and 20% of hers and RL's time on an annual basis. In addition, the rest of JBL's marketing activity falls by the wayside in order to focus on the A4E which she stressed would not be the case if there was additional resource/budget in place. GS reported that it does not impact the rest of the JBL team significantly save for those who work with clients who submit an application. He added that he also works closely with the sponsors together with AMc.

JB echoed GS and AMc's views. He supported Jersey having an awards for excellence. However, he noted that a significant amount of time and effort is required to encourage people to enter which indicates that there is not enough interest for the competition. He accepted that JBL is the best placed organisation to organise the event but agreed that JBL's P&L must be protected. JB suggested that consideration could be given to a building a smaller awards event into Enterprise Week. However, he does not believe the A4E in their existing form and with JBL's current budget constraints are worth the time and effort.

JD echoed all previous comments. However, he suggested that the awards do add value. He added that it was less about winning an award and more about what companies will learn about themselves by going through the entry process. JD agreed that the cost of organising the event should not be on JBL's P&L. He therefore proposed that consideration should only be given to JBL continuing to organise A4E subject to funding being received from the EPGDPF or the event being underwritten by government.

EL suggested that the awards do have value for some entrants and winners and he believes that some definitely see value in entering, particularly from an internal perspective. However, he accepted that there was a challenge in highlighting the value and securing sponsors, noting that businesses no longer have money available to provide sponsorship of £12k as they have historically. He added that the other challenge is a suitable venue.

KLF also agreed that the awards provide value, noting that they provide companies with recognition which uplifts and inspires them. She added that the process which entrants go through is very important, particularly for small businesses who tend to get immersed in what they are doing and quite often don't see the "bigger picture". She stressed that the awards are beneficial but

accepted that they may only be recognisable to those who have entered. However, she accepted that there was an issue with timing and cost. Therefore unless the A4E is underwritten or funded by government she agreed that JBL should no longer take responsibility for the cost of the event.

KLF noted that there are already a significant amount of awards ceremonies and she therefore suggested combining the A4E with another awards event (e.g. JCC or CIM) whereby a multi-awards ceremony could be held with the cost and risk being split. WL queried how this would work on the basis that JBL are not industry specific and KLF suggested that if a company has already won an award within their sector, they may be willing to apply for a JBL award. However, JB noted that previous feedback received on the A4E was that there was too many awards and therefore combining awards ceremonies may not be welcomed. JD added that concerns about a venue would be even more of an issue if awards ceremonies were combined as it would result in twice as many attendees. EL suggested that the IOD would push back on the proposal of a combined event, noting that their awards are connected with the IOD in the UK, albeit that they also have a challenge in attracting people to their awards event. GS suggested that whilst it may be possible for the winners of individual sector awards to be brought forward in one event he would not propose merging with another event, noting that the JCC awards are very successful and industry specific and are seen as a get together for the industry.

KLF accepted that it would be disappointing to lose the event and suggested that consideration could be given to paring it down instead. JB reiterated his proposal of holding something during Enterprise Week. He proposed that winners could be announced during the week with a relaxed drinks / finger food reception being held at the end of the week. However, although KLF supported this idea, she noted that Enterprise Week was already very busy and expressed concern that an awards event may be too much.

BS stressed that if JBL do not receive confirmation that the event will be underwritten, the Board should not consider going ahead with it whereas if it is underwritten, it should go ahead but with consideration given to specific awards to ensure that focus is not just placed on big companies

Finally, WL provided her thoughts. She advised that she does not believe JBL can continue with the awards event due to the venue and the financial risk of doing so. However, she suggested that something should be done within JBL's existing budget during Enterprise Week (e.g. a sandwich lunch event) which will profile businesses in various sectors who have already won or entered for awards within their own industry. Furthermore JBL should present an award of its own (to be assessed by the JBL team from the businesses it has supported through the year or from the businesses profiled on the recognition site, proposed by AMc above). She added that this type of event will negate the requirement for sponsors but will ensure collaboration between JBL and the business sector. She accepted that whilst businesses will lose the value previously gained by going through the entry process for the A4E, JBL will ensure that they are given recognition on the website.

AM left the meeting at 12.15pm

**IT WAS RESOLVED** that WL and GS would arrange to meet with the Minister and Chief Officer for EDTS&C to discuss the board views as expressed above.

**7. Finance and Audit Sub Committee Update**

BS updated the board further to the minutes which had been circulated previously. GS also took the opportunity of walking the board through the end of June management accounts which had been prepared post the Finance Subcommittee.

**8. Operations Report**

GS summarised the Operations Report, a copy of which had been circulated with the Board Pack.

He pointed out that JBL was behind in its expenditure plan for the Export and Efficiency programmes however this was because of the main bid to the EPGDP fund which if approved would have a material impact on these programmes

**9. Risk Register**

The Board reviewed the Risk Register and GS summarised the major movements which had taken place since the previous Board meeting.

**10. Any Other Business**

None

**11. Date of Next Meeting**

**IT WAS NOTED** that the next meeting was scheduled for 28<sup>th</sup> September at 9am.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was closed at 1pm.

WLambert

Chairman

6<sup>th</sup> October 2016

Date Signed

**Actions**

- 1) AM to prepare a revised version of the A Minutes of 25<sup>th</sup> May 2016 for WL's signature (completed 12<sup>th</sup> July 2016)
- 2) GS to provide the Board with an update on his meeting with RBSI's Head of Retail and Business Banking on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016 re E-Spark
- 3) JB to circulate the 'General Data Protection Regulations' (GDPR) link
- 4) GS to put a cyber security, business continuity, disaster recovery policy together for JB's review and then bring to the Board for discussion
- 5) GS and WL to arrange a meeting with the Minister and Chief Officer of EDTS&C to discuss the views of the JBL Board on the Awards for Enterprise

