



CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

1400 hrs on Tuesday 11 September 2018 in the
Port Health Offices, Falmouth Docks

Members:	Ian Munday	Chairman	IM
	Neil Andrew		NA
	Don Garman		DG
	Richard Jeffery		RJ
	Mat Spencer		MSp
	Tony Tomlinson		TT
In attendance:	Mark Sansom		CEO
	Mary Stribley	Minutes	MSt

Governance

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Toby Budd, Andy Grant, Peter Grounds and Anne Oliver.

2. Declarations of interest

The Chairman asked for declarations of interest. He said that there will always be instances where there is a crossover between business and customer interests, between members and FHC, but this type of relationship does not impede the fair consideration of the matters on the agenda.

3. Approval of minutes of the last meeting – 12 June 2018

The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as an accurate record.

4. Matters arising

a) Stakeholder engagement panel minutes to be provided to the CC

ACTION: NA and IM to be invited to attend the next meeting.

b) CEO to draft Donations Plan – on agenda.



Falmouth Harbour
Commissioners

- c) **CC members to complete SWOT analysis for discussion at next meeting – on agenda.**
- d) **Working Group to undertake FHC Governance Audit – on agenda.**

Reports

5. a) **Minutes of Harbour Board Meetings: June-August 2018**

DG asked about GDPR regulations.

NA asked about the new MCzs, specifically the one proposed for Carrick Roads; TT said that this is not currently proposed but there is currently consultation on one in the Helford.

b) **Stakeholder Engagement Panel meeting minutes – 15 May 2018**

IM said that these minutes were useful and noted that there is quite a lot of crossover with the work of the Consultative Committee. TT agreed. IM asked if the CC member should be a member not 'in attendance'. CEO said that we will put it on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting. It was noted that Ben Grigg will be TT's successor as chair of the Stakeholder Engagement Panel.

c) **Governance Audit report**

It was agreed that this had been a worthwhile exercise, which had been undertaken at the end of the last Board Meeting. It was also agreed to conduct this audit every three years, and align it to the PMSC declaration exercise. TT said that it was well received by the Board; nobody was quite sure what to expect, but this was straightforward and compact and it was a very useful exercise. There were a couple of items which could be left out as they were not quite applicable, he added.

Draft Complaints Procedure was tabled and circulated by CEO. IM explained the purpose. MSp asked if it was for anything specific, and CEO said mainly governance issues. DG suggested maybe making it clear as to its purpose. IM asked how to promulgate it; CEO replied that it would be on FHC's website. The committee was informed that the DfT do consider poor governance complaints should the port be unable to resolve them. MSp said it would be useful to see hierarchal procedures in the form of a flow chart.

ACTION: CEO to upgrade the Complaints Procedure to include other complaint types and a flow chart to explain how complaints are dealt with.



Falmouth Harbour Commissioners

NA asked if the Board should be dealing with all complaints at their meetings. TT said that they have had to deal with some but do not get involved in detailed complaints such as those relating to car parking. He added that an 'open door' approach is a much better route. MSp suggested that the complaint still has to be logged; TT said that they are.

CEO said that customer complaints are used as an indicator of business performance by the management panels. Significant complaints were dealt with at Board level and pointed to an example of this in the minutes.

IM said that generally the process was OK but it should be upgraded to reflect the comments made.

MSp said that, looking at the governance audit, accountability had been highlighted yellow, and he asked why. It was felt that this was an oversight in the production of the audit.

RJ asked if it was rigorous enough, and suggested that normally you only get reports on exception basis; did this provide sufficient challenge. TT said that he felt that it had been suitably rigorous.

CEO mentioned that the principles of good governance have been in place for quite a number of years and therefore a good level of performance should be expected.

DG added that all the auditors felt that they were able to make a contribution.

IM asked if CEO had thought of pushing it back up to the DfT. CEO said we could, if we wrote it up as an example of good practice.

d) Draft Donations Policy

IM noted that FHC list their investment in infrastructure high up in the policy. Local maritime charities have been included to be consistent with current policies. DG asked how the decision is made. TT suggested the applicants identify what they are going to use the money for and where they would spend it, like a scoring system.

IM suggested we ask applicants to fill in a form, to build up a picture. CEO asked if we need an application form to go alongside the policy; IM thought this would be a good idea, and offered a form that he has, as an example.

ACTION: IM to forward an application form he has to CEO.



Falmouth Harbour Commissioners

NA asked if there is a date that applications will be considered by. MS said that the Board will determine one to fit in with their budgeting cycle. IM said that this should be included on the form.

DG spoke about discounting for events and supporting of internships which would still provide stakeholder benefits. CEO mentioned that there were wider aspects to the stakeholder benefit as well as donations which had been included in the policy.

Project Updates

6. a) Port of Falmouth Development Initiative

IM asked if there were any developments on the Port of Falmouth Masterplan, as it was published in 2011. CEO replied that a large number of these projects have been achieved – except the dredging. IM asked if there is a plan to do another one, and CEO said that the Port of Falmouth Masterplan cost IRO £250k, so there is no current appetite for another one. IM pointed out the advantages of developing against a planned approach.

TT mentioned that the masterplan had been supplemented by the Penryn River Study which had extended the plan area.

MSp commented on the lack of a joined-up approach within the town. He would like to instigate a port forum to encourage people get back together and talking like they used to. It was agreed that a review of the masterplan would be a good place to start. CEO said he was happy to do the invites and propose a meeting. MSp said that World Fuel Services would be willing to attend.

ACTION: CEO to set up a masterplan review meeting.

CEO mentioned that FHC is still having difficulties with the MMO at the moment. MSp asked at what point FHC will say we are not putting any more resources into this. CEO agreed that FHC would like to get this resolved but stated that there were important points of principle involved that would impact on all future developments unless they were addressed.

b) Future projects

CEO said that Falmouth Haven have done some work around various opportunities, mostly around small boat facilities. Shelter for facilities was the biggest problem with the cost of breakwater pontoons impacting on the viability of schemes.



Falmouth Harbour Commissioners

CEO mentioned the opportunities that are currently being explored around a proposed floating restaurant with access from Church St Car Park. There is the potential to use the access to the pontoon structure to build on in the future. The project is at an early stage and we are working with the investor and FTC on it. IM asked when this might come to fruition, and CEO said it could be ready for next summer.

Consultations

7. a) SWOT exercise

VS was invited to speak.

She explained that a requirement of new ISO 9000 standards is to examine the context of the organisation. In order to do this, the Board would undertake a PESTLE and SWOT analysis and they were asking some of their stakeholder groups to produce a SWOT analysis to feed into their process.

The exercise also helps with meeting Trust Port governance requirements. We need to define who our interested parties are, and it would be helpful to have the Consultative Committee's input.

From this we can try to identify risks and opportunities, and decide how we should respond to those. It will also help us identify objectives for both strategic (projects) day-to-day (operational levels).

IM said that we did one last year and forms had been circulated prior to the meeting in order to allow members to collate their ideas. The following lists were drawn up as a result of the discussions:



Falmouth Harbour
Commissioners

Strengths

Effective Consultative Committee (!)
Transparency
Geography – Physical
Geopolitical boundary
FaBTest
Location near shipping in SECA zone
Approachable staff
Good crossover
Monopoly
Unique physical assets
Low staff turnover (generally)
Ease of recruitment
Customer relations generally good
Willing to be challenged and responds to those challenges – resilient/adaptable/proactive
Divisional structure
High safety and risk management awareness – Seasonal Regulation Officer appointment can be an issue
Training and staff development

Weaknesses

Monopoly
Pension liabilities – income streams
Restricted slipway facilities
Expensive bunkers
Connectivity and infrastructure
Constraints of geography
Lack of internal communication
Lack of unitary organisation
Geopolitical boundary
Excessive bureaucracy
Split personality – one of the challenges
No publically-stated PIs (diagrammatical presentation)
Perception of lack of accountability and transparency
Slow to respond to change – staff flexibility
Challenge of cross-training
Fleet of vessels not effectively being utilised

SWOT

Opportunities

More moorings
Shipping waiting off limits
Assets
Changing port limits
Improved marketing
Leisure market growth – demand not be fulfilled – new customers who no longer exist – Talked about promoting mooring exchange scheme
Enhancement of services through technology
One Falmouth brand – marketing Falmouth
Expanding the size of the harbour
Acquiring business with another moorings contractor – Is 'moorings' the key business or 'hiring of moorings'? Strategic review of what is core business
Emergency response – maintaining critical mass of staff
Tugs – opportunity for FHC to join the market
Use of facilities and personnel who could provide learning/education opportunities for schools and colleges
Relocation of harbour office – is it fit for purpose?
Best practice training schemes – can be a political issue around these things

Threats

Leisure market growth – demand not being fulfilled
Bunker port competition
Major pollution incident
Siltation
Technology making pilotage redundant – Autonomous ships – VTS prohibitively expensive
Economic / world trade / Brexit / commercial market competition and change of direction
Public competition
Industrial accident
Changing Govt policies



Falmouth Harbour
Commissioners

Urgent Business

Neil Andrew asked about his length of service.

ACTION: MSt to investigate NA's length of service.

Any Other Business

The Chairman went round the table, asking for any other items for discussion:

a) Front Office development

IM asked for details of the front office development and asked if it is to create an office for everyone to use, instead of the hut on the Marina. CEO said that this hut would remain in use.

b) Coverack 'Port Authority'

DG suggested FHC have a competitor via 'Coverack Port Authority'. CEO said that this matter is being dealt with.

9. Date of next meeting

Friday 7 December 2018 (joint meeting with Board).

The meeting closed at 1610 hrs.