

From: Brian Flynn
To: presidential.commission@ice.org.uk
Subject: Presidential Commission
Date: 09 June 2019 13:41:46

Dear David

It was good to meet again , if only briefly, at the open session of the Commission in February. You were I am sure an obvious and ideal candidate for the Chairman job given your review of governance in 2006. But the events of last summer may prove a bigger challenge. As I mentioned I am very much of the same opinion as Paul Jowitt and Jean Venables and I believe what happened was wrong both in terms of content and method of achievement. However we are where we are and I can only wish you all the best in your efforts to produce a satisfactory solution and heal the divisions.

I attach some observations/comments on particular matters which I think are relevant. These are very much based on my personal experience in the eighteen years since I was first on Council

1.THE NEW COUNCIL Council has changed from being an all powerful body to an advisory role subservient to the appointed Trustee Board. A Council which 'nodded through' the events of last summer clearly needs some restructuring. Given our regional and international spread it cannot be reduced in size. I see two possible future developments. It may wither with members showing poor attendance and not reading meeting papers. Or alternatively it develops a militant tendency towards the Trustee Board (rather as happened with our IMechE neighbours). Neither option is in the best interest of ICE.

2 INTER COUNCIL COMMUNICATION You will remember that 20 years ago the Council Handbook contained the home addresses, phone numbers and email addresses of all Council members. This enabled considerable interaction in the intervals between the then five meetings a year. The Data Protection Act has now stopped such publication. Members meet their fellows four times a year sometimes standing up and with their lunch in one hand. But of course with the agreement of members (unlikely to be withheld) this data could again be circulated. It would reduce 'establishment' ability to control Council but in the present climate this would be a good thing

3 CULTURE OF SECRECY . I think that more than anything else this was the real trigger for the SGM. In my first three years on Council I can remember only two matters being treated as confidential. Secrecy has it seems reached the point where Council papers are circulated on tablets from which papers cannot be shared or printed. This sort of thing creates mistrust. However I am greatly encouraged by the knowledge that it has now been hacked. We are after all a body of innovators and lateral thinkers.

4. NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE You will I know remember a previous version of this. We were both complicit in its production. It comprised the President, the three succeeding

VPs and five elected members of Council. This gave it a democratic majority and I remember one PP being somewhat miffed that he was unable to join it. When was this changed and why?. If a clear majority is directly elected from Council it will firstly return some real power to Council and in addition avoid any impression however unjustified that senior officers of the ICE are selected by friends.

5. STEWARDS ENQUIRY The risk management that I practice these days is done mostly on Newmarket racecourse. Even there things sometimes go wrong. The Jockey Club then institutes an enquiry and endeavours to learn from its mistakes. When eventually the dust settles on our governance problems it might be an idea to undertake a similar exercise. This should not happen in any spirit of recrimination or witch hunt but purely with a view to avoiding future repeats.

Once again I wish you well with this big challenge

Best regards

Brian