

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting

**Date of Meeting:** 5 September 2018

**Attendees:**

Caroline Ottaway–Searle (COS - Chair)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM – minutes)	TNA
Lucy Fletcher (LF)	TNA	Sam Whaley (SW)	TNA
John Sheridan (JS)	TNA	Irene Griffin (IG)	TNA
Val Johnson (VJ)	TNA	Moore Stephens Representative 1 (MSR1)	Moore Stephens
		Moore Stephens Representative 2 (MSR 2)	Moore Stephens
		Claire McNulty (CM)	TNA
		Places of Deposit Compliance & Development Manager (PDCDM)	TNA
		Malcolm Todd (MT)	TNA
		Mandy Goldsmith-Umney (MGU)	TNA
		Louisa Green (LG)	TNA
		Academic Programmes Manager (APM)	TNA

**Apologies:** Paul Davies (PD), Jeff James (JJ), Neil Curtis (NC)

		Action
1.0	<b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b>	
1.1	No conflicts of interest were declared.	
1.2	The minutes of the previous meeting held on 22 August 2018 were reviewed and approved subject to some minor amendments.	
1.3	The action log was reviewed and updated.	
2.0	<b><u>Internal Audit recommendations</u></b>	
2.1	The Executive Team was asked to review the status of outstanding recommendations from completed internal audits, and suggest any amendments prior to these being presented to the Audit & Risk Committee on the 19 September 2018.	
2.2	The Executive Team reviewed and discussed the report.	
2.3	Executive Team agreed a number of requests be made to ARC for extensions to outstanding recommendations.	

2.4	<b>Executive Team agreed the report.</b>	
3.0	<b><u>Moore Stephens - internal audit plan</u></b>	
3.1	JS advised that Executive Team were of the view that a number of conversations were needed with both Board and ARC regarding the planned Risk Appetite refresh work.	
3.2	<u>Action:</u> JS to discuss plans for further work around corporate risk appetites with PD. Due 12/09/18	JS
3.3	COS advised that we looked forward to working with MS and acknowledged that it would take time for them to learn about our organisation.	
3.4	COS explained that there was a desire to work up a detailed plan for 18/19 however when looking forward into 19/20 and 20/21 an indication of approach would be more appropriate rather than a detailed plan. Outcomes of the tailored review, our new strategic plan and the next CSR would all influence the focus of internal audit	
3.5	Executive Team and MS's representatives had a considered discussion about the proposed plan and approved a way forward.	
3.6	<u>Action:</u> MS's representatives to review the Statement of Public Task. Due 12/9/18	MS
3.7	COS advised that much work was ongoing relating to changes to Government and Remote services and therefore it would be sensible for the audit to commence in March 2019.	
3.8	Executive Team discussed risks around international strategy and commercial revenue.	
3.9	<u>Action:</u> IG to ask NC to review the international strategy audit plans. Due 12/09/18	IG
3.10	<u>Action:</u> MS to redraft plans for years 2 and 3 with a more generic view. Due 12/09/18	MS
3.11	<u>Action:</u> PJM to share comments posted on Convene with IG. Due 07/09/18	PJM
3.12	Executive Team reviewed the draft Internal Audit Charter.	
3.13	SW noted that the content of the Internal Audit Charter needed to match content of the Board's terms of reference and the Statement of Public Task.	
3.14	IG stated that NC had asked that thought should be given around audit scoping times and how the de-brief would work.	
3.15	<u>Action:</u> Executive Team to review approach to the internal audit process. IG to discuss with PD and seek a date. Due 12/09/18	IG
4.0	<b><u>Place of Deposit Network in a Digital Environment</u></b>	

4.1	A paper on Rethinking the Place of Deposit Network in a Digital Environment was presented to Executive Team for discussion and comment. Support was sought for the formation of a cross-departmental working group which will examine the evidence base, consider the key strategic issues and develop costed delivery models for Executive Team's future consideration.	
4.2	LF advised that this was the start of a conversation and it raised some important governance questions.	
4.3	CM said that there were pockets where progress was being made around digital but the landscape had not yet been fully mapped out.	
4.4	<u>Action:</u> LF and the team to build up scoped proposals and return to Executive Team at a future date. Due 30/11/18	LF
4.5	<b>Executive Team agreed the formation of a cross-departmental working group.</b>	
5.0	<b><u>Request for deposit of records</u></b>	
5.1	Executive Team discussed a request for the deposit of records to The National Archives.	
5.2	LF advised that we were not at a point where a decision could be made as a great deal of legal and other opinion needed to be sought externally.	
5.3	<b>Executive Team noted the request and requested options be worked up for review by the Executive Team ahead of decision.</b>	
5.4	<u>Action:</u> LF to gather further evidence and advice and prepare an options paper for Executive Team. Due 5/10/18	LF
6.0	<b><u>Section 35 and 36</u></b>	
6.1	Executive Team was asked to note a paper describing FOIA exemptions: sections 35 and 36.	
6.2	LG advised that a section 36 Exception required The Chief Executive and Keeper to give an opinion whereas previously only their agreement was recorded.	
6.3	SW said that there have been occasions when the Advisory Council on National Records and Archives have had to deal with Section 36 exemptions and briefings were provided for the Master of the Rolls.	
6.4	LG updated the Executive Team on the FOI centre workload.	
6.5	<b>Executive Team noted the paper.</b>	
7.0	<b><u>Collaborative Doctoral Partnership</u></b>	
7.1	Executive Team was asked to provide support for The National Archives application for the third iteration of the Arts and Humanities Research Council Collaborative Doctoral Partnership programme.	

7.2	APM noted that as a government department, cultural institution and leader of the archives sector we were in a unique position.
7.3	APM explained that we were in control of who we collaborated with and what topics were chosen.
7.4	APM said that our increased investment, ambition and capacity now allows us to apply as a single institution.
7.5	APM advised that students can come from anywhere in the European Economic Area.
7.6	JS noted the importance of providing those supervising the nine studentships with the right guidance and support.
7.7	APM stated that there were processes in place to provide assistance to supervisors looking after studentships and interventions would be made if student performance was poor.
7.8	VJ said that there were 'break off' clauses and there were ways out if performance was poor.
7.9	LF noted the importance of being clear around our use of language, noting the distinction between 'academic policy' and 'government policy'.
7.10	<b>Executive Team supported and agreed the proposal agreed to the resource commitment.</b>
8.0	<b><u>AOB / Diary Review</u></b>
8.1	NAO – Executive Team noted the updated audit completion report that had previously been distributed to Executive Team.
8.2	Catering – Executive Team noted the agreement reached by write round on the proposals set out in the paper on catering plans.
8.3	<b>There being no other business the meeting was brought to a close.</b>

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting

**Date of Meeting:** 12 September 2018

**Attendees:**

Lucy Fletcher (LF - Chair)	TNA	Kristen Dilworth (KD – minutes)	TNA
Paul Davies (PD)	TNA	Sam Whaley (SW)	TNA
Jeff James (JJ)	TNA	David Harding (DH)	TNA
Val Johnson (VJ) ( not item 3)	TNA		

**Apologies:** Neil Curtis (NC), Caroline Ottaway–Searle (COS), John Sheridan (JS)

		Action
1.0	<b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b>	
1.1	No conflicts of interest were declared.	
1.2	The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 September 2018 were reviewed and approved subject to some minor amendments.	
1.3	The action log was reviewed and updated.	
2.0	<b><u>Benchmarking</u></b>	
2.1	DH presented the report.	
2.2	<u>Action:</u> The Executive Team were asked to review the database of the metrics that have been collected by each directorate and bring up to date and question why the metrics are being collected. E.g., are they mandatory? Are we obliged to supply data to an outside agency or is it to support efficiency, productivity etc?	ALL
2.3	DH explained that the objective is to reduce the number of metrics that are useful and have purpose.	
2.4	The Executive Team complemented and thanked DH and IG for their work on compiling the database of metrics from other cultural sectoral organisations.	
2.5	The Executive Team discussed the proposal to benchmark a small number of metrics with other national archives both in the UK and overseas.	
2.6	The Executive Team agreed that DH and IG should continue to develop these metrics in readiness for the Chief Executive to raise the subject of benchmarking to his international colleagues.	
3.0	<b><u>August Dashboard</u></b>	
3.1	The Executive Team were asked to review and approve the August Dashboard	
3.2	JJ noted that the Dashboard indicated FOI performance within agreed tolerance levels despite remaining in contingency measures. However, pre Board notes from LF and PD indicated potential risk to service performance	
3.3	<u>Action:</u> FOI Service Performance - PD to provide a one page status report highlighting potential risks and suggested actions, LF to assist PD if needed. Due 03/10/18	PD
4.0	<b><u>AOB / Diary Review</u></b>	
4.1	LF explained that the Charitable trust meeting went well, but a future discussion on resourcing will be needed in a few months' time.	

4.2	<b>There being no other business the meeting was brought to a close.</b>	
-----	--	--

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting

**Date of Meeting:** 24 September 2018

**Attendees:**

Neil Curtis (NC – Chair)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM – minutes)	TNA
Paul Davies (PD)	TNA	Pauline Moore (PM – item 2 intro only)	TNA
Caroline Ottaway–Searle (COS)	TNA		
John Sheridan (JS)	TNA		
Lucy Fletcher (LF – from item 2 onwards)	TNA		

**Apologies:** Val Johnson (VJ), Jeff James (JJ)

		Action
1.0	<b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b>	
1.1	No conflicts of interest were declared.	
1.2	The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 September 2018 were reviewed and approved subject to some minor amendments.	
1.3	The action log was reviewed and updated.	
2.0	<b><u>Developing our Future Workforce – discussion</u></b>	
2.1	Executive Team was asked to note the early indications of what the 6+6 forecast position might be.	
2.2	PM took Executive Team through the early indications of the 6+6 forecast position.	
2.3	<b>Executive Team discussed recruitment plans and agreed an approach.</b>	
3.0	<b>AOB</b>	
3.1	<b>There being no other business the meeting was brought to a close.</b>	