

Retail Enforcement Project

MINUTES OF REP STEERING GROUP MEETING

Meeting held on Wednesday 16th May, at Admiralty Arch, room 01.44

Chair:

Gerry Murphy (Kingfisher plc) GM

Attendees:

Xavier Baby	(BRE)	XB
Stuart Benson	(Cornwall LA)	SB
David Bryce-Smith	(Bexley LA)	DB-S
Allan Davies	(Health & Safety Executive)	AD
Janet Faulkner	(Warwickshire LA)	JF
David Fisher	(Office of Fair Trading)	DF
Ron Gainsford	(Trading Standards Institute)	RG
Harold Gay	(Alliance Boots)	HG
Karen Hill	(Better Regulation Executive)	KH
Clive Jones	(Better Regulation Executive)	CJ
Helen Jones	(Kingfisher plc)	HJ
Jenny Morris	(Chartered Institute of Environmental Health)	JeM
Jitinder Kohli	(Better Regulation Executive)	JK
Alan Lacey	(J Sainsbury)	AL
David Mattes	(Department of Trade and Industry)	DM
Julia Monk	(Food Standards Agency)	JuM
Will Straw	(HM Treasury)	WS
David Whiting	(London Fire Brigade)	DW
Emma Winsor-Cundell	(Federation of Small Businesses)	EW
Chad Woodward	(Better Regulation Executive)	CW
Graham Wynn	(British Retail Consortium)	GW

Apologies:

Wendy Martin	(LACoRS)
Matthew Fell	(Confederation of British Industry)
Phillip Cullum	(National Consumer Council)
Graham Jukes	(Chartered Institute of Environmental Health)

Topics Covered

1. Introductions
2. Presentation: What is REP?
3. Steering group ways of working
4. Terms of Reference: agreement and sign-off
5. Business case:
 - o Objectives
 - o Success Criteria
 - o Risks
6. Progress to date:
 - o Implementation approach
 - o Local Authority roll-out plan
 - o Derogation
 - o Development work
 - o Procurement update
 - o Communications plan
7. AOB & date of next meeting

Minutes/Actions from Current Meeting

Ref	Action/Minute	Resp.	Date
1.	<p>Introductions</p> <p>GM opened the meeting and set expectations for both the project and the steering group. In respect of the project, GM noted that it was concerned with reallocation,</p>		

	<p>rather than reduction, of regulatory resource away from compliant businesses towards high risk businesses. In respect of the steering group, he requested they come to the group with solutions and constructive ideas, provide leadership and ensure key project decisions are made.</p> <p>2. <u>What is REP?:</u> CJ took the group through the presentation at appendix A, covering the background of the project, objectives, success criteria and key risks (taken from the business case). DB-S shared the example of a multi-disciplinary enforcement exercise in Bexley, which had had successful outcomes. RG applauded this, but noted that these activities occur anyway and not because of REP. All agreed, however, that REP increases support for these activities by releasing resource.</p> <p>3. <u>Ways of working:</u> CJ invited the group to share how they might be able to get involved in REP. DF noted that he felt the group should have involvement on key elements of the project, including risks. <i>Actions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email the project team with what role steering group members wish to play. • Email the project team with what learnings / resource the steering group are able to share. • Provide updates to steering group on progress between meetings. • Invite steering group members to attend on-site REP inspections. • Involve steering group in key elements of the project. </p> <p>4. <u>Terms of Reference agreement & sign-off:</u> All were in broad agreement with the ToR (appendix B). JeM highlighted concern from CIEH about the lack of evidence of the benefits of Phase 1, which brought into question being able to “champion” the concept, but was pleased that the project team were looking to put this on a firm footing for Phase 2. GM noted the project is about building a robust evidence base and welcomed “critical friends” as long as everyone was constructive. GM confirmed that the ToR should be reviewed in 6 months’ time and the group agreed the ToR on that basis. <i>Actions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisit in 6 months. </p> <p>5. <u>Business Case:</u> Building on CJ’s earlier presentation, KH sought views on Objectives, Success Criteria and Risks. DF suggested that the group become actively involved in ownership of Risk. KH welcomed this across all key areas of the project. <i>Actions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete plan to manage the key risks and seek feedback from the group. </p> <p>6. <u>Progress to Date:</u> <u>Approach / LA roll-out plan:</u> KH highlighted the phenomenal level of interest (80 LAs already at different levels of engagement) and noted that the approach would be a phased roll-out. The group agreed that there was a need for careful selection to ensure sound mix of geography and LA type and that the devolved assemblies should be more comprehensively covered. <i>Actions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisit the mix at the next meeting. </p> <p><u>Derogation:</u> KH noted that successful meetings had taken place with the Audit Commission and HSE. JuM commented that the Foods Standards Agency was working on a way of bringing the REP and new FSA. Outcome based strategy together. She requested a copy of the other agreements. KH highlighted the importance of getting the derogations agreed to mitigate the genuine concern from LAs and suggested pulling together a draft communication. Discussion ensued on the best way to communicate this. SB suggested communication through LACoRS to all LAs. RG agreed with taking the opportunity to promote REP, and highlighted the importance of ensuring this is not seen as being part of an efficiency saving exercise. <i>Actions:</i></p>	<p>All All CW Project team Project team</p> <p>All</p> <p>Project Team</p> <p>KH</p>	<p>June Ongoing Monthly Ongoing Ongoing</p> <p>November</p> <p>Next Meeting</p> <p>Next meeting</p>
--	--	--	---

