

**POTATOES
SHADOW SECTOR
COMPANY**

AUTHORISED

**MINUTES OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE POTATOES
SHADOW SECTOR COMPANY HELD AT NASH COURT,
OXFORD ON WEDNESDAY 6 FEBRUARY 2008**

- * Prof Janet Bainbridge - Chair
- * Mr Tony Bambridge) - Growers
- * Mr Colin Bradley)
- * Mr Jim Cruickshank)
- Mr Robert Doig)
- * Mr Graham Nichols)
- * Mr Tim Papworth)
- * Mr Fraser Scott)
- Mr Alex Stephens)
- * Mr Duncan Worth)
- * Mr David Rankin) - Grower/packers
- * Mr Nick Tapp)
- * Mr Nick Vermont - Processor representative
- * Mrs Fiona Fell) - Independent members
- * Mr Dennis Heywood)
- * Present

In attendance: Mrs Helen Priestley, BPC Chief Executive
Mrs Inga Martin, Company Secretary
Mrs Kathryn Race, BPC Marketing Director
Dr Mike Storey, BPC R&D Director
Mr Steve Moore, BPC Head of Finance & IT (Item 08/25)

ACTIONS

08/16 CHAIR'S OPENING REMARKS

The Chair welcomed members and staff to the sixth meeting of the Shadow Board, held at the BPC's office at Oxford. She said

the Board recognised that the Directors were personally affected by the ongoing change process, as were the staff for whom they were responsible. There were challenges ahead and the Board would depend on their contributions and support in addressing these.

The Chair said that the new organisational structure, comprising an NDPB and a number of subsidiaries, was a modified version of the model proposed by Radcliffe, set up to operate at arms length from Government. AHDB, as part of the DEFRA family, had its own remit as an industry wide organisation, and was not a mouthpiece for any other body.

Prof Bainbridge said that she, along with the other Sector Chairs, had been appointed by the Ministers. Hers was a dual role, being part of ADHB and representing the potato sector on that board, through PCL. The contracts for the period beyond 1 April 2008 had not yet been offered but it was realistic to believe that there would be limited time resources to share between the various components of the post.

What was beyond question was that the change process was in train – ‘the show was on the road’. Another undisputed fact was that the PCL board was very strong with a wealth of expertise, which was essential for successful delivery to levy payers. Prof Bainbridge promised that she would do all she could to help achieve success. There would be debates and differences of opinion but, once board decisions had been made, these had to be translated into clear and unambiguous messages.

08/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Messrs Doig and Stephens.

8/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

There were no new declarations to make. The Register of Members’ interests is at Annex 3 to these Minutes (Members only).

08/19 MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING HELD ON 9 JANUARY 2008 (PCM/08/01)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2008 were approved and signed as a true record.

08/20 MATTERS ARISING (PCP/08/01)

AHDB Attendance at Board meetings (Minute 08/09)

Members had suggested that AHDB should be encouraged to send a representative to PCL Board meetings.

Kevin Roberts, Interim CEO of AHDB had met members on the evening of 5 February (see Minute 08/21). Clare Dodgson had confirmed that she would be happy to attend the Board meeting in March. Ms Dodgson was an independent member of AHDB, with particular responsibility for financial matters; she headed up the working group on reorganisation and relocation.

Questions for AHDB (Minute 08/05)

Questions from members had been collated and sent to Kevin Roberts on 23 January, as agreed, in preparation for the meeting on 5 February.

DEFRA Newsletters (Minute 08/05)

Board members had been added to the circulation list for the full version of the newsletter.

Memorandum & articles of Association (Minute 08/06)

It had come to light that there would be further changes to the Mem & Arts, and that these would be provided in February.

Members' contact details (Minute 08/08)

The Board had agreed to adopt a policy of openness, once the PCL achieved legal status, by publishing Members' business contact details on the website and in relevant publications. The Chair said that she had been advised against disclosing her private address, as this would have implications for her property insurance. It was agreed that the PCL head office address could be shown for any Member whose address was a private residence.

Advisory Working Groups (Minute 08/09)

The Board noted that two additional staff members had been seconded to the working groups:

Phil Bradshaw – Market Intelligence Group
Adrian Cunnington – RD/KT Group (re SBEU)

08/21 REPORT ON PRE-MEETING

The Chair and Members had met Kevin Roberts, interim CEO of AHDB, the previous evening. A number of questions had been

raised by Members in advance of the meeting and the following responses had been given:

Delegation Agreement

This was in effect a document setting out those activities which AHDB would be empowered to carry out by the Statutory Instrument and which it was delegating to PCL. It would shortly be provided in draft form, for discussion.

Communications between AHDB and PCL

These would happen as often as required, primarily through the Chair.

Communications with levy payers

AHDB saw this as a function for PCL, as Members knew, and understood, their levy payers. Mr Tapp said it was his understanding that Mr Roberts wanted to be kept 'in the loop', and saw himself as the first point of contact with AHDB.

Possible job losses

There were currently no specified plans for job losses. As and when such proposals were developed, the proper consultation processes would be followed and PCL would be involved in these.

Mr Tapp reiterated that uncertainty and lack of knowledge was unsettling. Mr Vermont, concurring, said that, due to distances between existing offices, the intended relocation would of necessity cause redundancies. He suggested that PCL should introduce its own retention strategy.

Back office/levy collection model

Members had stressed the importance of safeguarding the potato-specific aspects of the system. Mr Roberts had given a strong message that the systems would be migrated and that the result would be a more cost effective but no less robust solution.

Market information and crisis management

The response had been that crisis management was a matter for each sector and market information had not yet been considered.

Mrs Priestley suggested that it would be sensible to develop

some views of what was required in terms of MI and crisis management. She would raise this with the other levy body CEOs during a conference call on 8 February. The Board agreed.

CEO

Plans for merging functional teams?

The point had been made that there would always be sector specific delivery.

Organisational structure, including review of CEO roles

DEFRA had commissioned a consultant from Tribal to advise, and she would set up meetings with CEOs and Chairs. Mr Heywood would also be involved in the consultation. It had been confirmed that the costs of the review would be paid from the transition budget.

Commercial services subsidiary

It had been confirmed that this related to the red meat sector and was not relevant to potatoes.

Potential costs savings, recouping monies and charging management fees

A number of finance issues had been discussed, and these were reported by the Finance Working Group – see Minute 08/25. Mrs Fell recommended that the Members should accept Mr Roberts' offer of speaking to them in some detail about the business plan.

Vision of success

The Chair said that the AHDB Board had set aside some time for considering this and developing a clear message.

Co-ordination and co-operation

There were already examples of this, for instance the Applied Research Forum, and the co-location would provide further opportunities.

Mr Bambridge commented that so much was still at a conceptual stage and there was such limited resource to drive the process. Mr Cruickshank agreed, making the point that once the transfer had taken place, there would be pressures to get on with things. Mr Vermont added that despite repeated messages that 'the sector would decide', he remained doubtful that PCL would be listened to.

The Chair said that PCL would have to fight its corner, and would not always have total support - as was the case with the BPC. However, she believed that there were genuine opportunities to influence: through the Board, through the Working Groups and through individuals. She agreed with Mr Tapp's contention that she was the principal conduit and that she had a major role in pushing for what the potato industry wanted – provided there was unanimity.

08/22 REPORT FROM AHDB MEETING

AHDB had met on 4 February, and the Chair presented a summary of the items discussed.

Timing of re-location

There was a growing realisation that the original target date for the re-location, 1 April 2009, was overly optimistic and that that the move was not likely to happen before, say, September of that year. Once the contracts had been signed, there would be more clarity and PCL would be informed.

Transitional working party

There had been some debate on the most appropriate location for the team which would prepare for the move. The decision was that the team would stay in Nobel House, London (DEFRA office) until the autumn of 2008 and then transfer to premises at Stoneleigh, as tenants of RASE.

Statutory Instrument

As reported previously, the AHDB Order had been delayed in the Scottish Parliament, due to a technicality, but Vesting Day on 1 April 2008 was not in jeopardy.

Sub-Committee on Marketing

Mr Chris Bones had presented a brief report on his review.

Accounting structure post 1 April 08

The Board had been asked to consider whether the new organisation should have group accounting or single entity accounting. The latter (which would have meant disbanding the subsidiaries) had benefits in terms of simplicity of records and transactions, lower taxation and fewer audit cost. However, it had been agreed that these aspects would have been outweighed by the negatives: loss of status, less transparency

and perceived lack of resolve. The Board had decided to choose group accounting. In making this decision, they had been assured that it would not bar them from reconsidering the issue at a future date, based on properly costed proposals.

Mrs Priestley commented that it seemed a pity that the Board was given little, if any, time for deliberation of important matters. Prof Bainbridge responded that time was indeed limited. However, the Sector Chairs met in advance of the Board meetings, to compare notes and discuss issues. In the case of the finance question, they had unanimously agreed on group accounting, as they felt the alternative would be one step too far. Mr Papworth felt that the Shadow Board should have been allowed to comment on such an important issue.

Staff Issues

AHDB had confirmed that the redundancy entitlements of BPC/PCL staff would be ring-fenced, though not placed in a separate bank account. There had been no discussion of retention policy. Mr Heywood said that, as Chairman of the PCL Staff Working Group, he considered that to be the top priority. Mrs Martin said that she would seek clarification, and as much information as possible, at the forthcoming HR Forum meeting.

Secretary

08/23 AHDB R&D SUB-COMMITTEE (PCP/08/17)

The Sub-Committee on R&D had presented its findings to AHDB on 4 February and Prof Bainbridge, who had led the review, reported on the outcome. The Paper, which gave details of the membership and process of the Committee, had been circulated.

The Committee's recommendations were that sector-facing research must continue in future and this had to be 'bottom up', that is driven by industry needs. There was no intention of discontinuing current project work so, as far as the potato sector was concerned, it was business as usual. At the same time, it was important to explore collaborative opportunities, as exemplified by the ARF. This forum, re-styled as AHRF, would be chaired by John Cross (EBLEX) for the first year, with Prof Bainbridge serving as the vice-Chair. These roles would then be reversed for the following year. The forum was currently run on a shoestring and it would be necessary to make a business case for increased funding and for more cross-collaboration.

These proposals had been accepted by AHDB. It was important to announce this with clarity to the industry, particularly as there were some contradictory messages circulating. A press release would be issued after the AHDB launch.

Dr Storey said that what made the ARF particularly valuable was the wide range of organisations represented on the group; this was not confined to the levy boards alone. Another benefit was the link to the Priorities Boards of DEFRA and the Scottish Government. Prof Bainbridge agreed that these features were crucial and confirmed that they would be retained in the new set-up.

In response to a question from Mrs Fell, the Chair said that the group would lobby for funding.

08/24 FUNCTIONAL COMMITTEES (PCP/08/10)

At its meeting in January, the Board had agreed to retain the formal system of functional Committees set up by the BPC. It had further been agreed that each Committee should be chaired by a PCL Member. Existing members had been invited to continue serving, following the transfer to PCL and there had been a very positive response.

The Board approved the membership of the following four Committees: Marketing Strategy, R&D, Market Information and Seed & Export. *Details are at Annex 1 to these Minutes.*

The Secretary suggested that when the Committees met they should review their terms of reference and other relevant conditions. In the meantime she would ascertain that PCL had the power to establish committees.

Secretary

08/25 REPORTS OF ADVISORY WORKING GROUPS (PCP/08/11)

Three of the Working Groups had met, and reports had been prepared for the Board. The remaining Groups had scheduled meetings.

STAFF ISSUES

Mr Heywood presented the report of the Staff Working Group, which had met on 31 January.

The agreed functions of the Group were:

- To ensure clarity of communication between the PCL Board and PCL staff.
- To interface with AHDB regarding personnel issues, including staff retention, recruitment and redundancies.
- To consider other relevant issues and make

recommendations to AHDB as appropriate.

It was evident that there were robust structures for communicating with staff, which PCL would inherit from BPC. What was needed were clear messages to communicate.

Mr Heywood said that there was still a shortage of information. For instance, AHDB would become the employer of all staff, with effect from 1 April 2008. Contracts entered into from that date would have new terms and conditions but those had not been confirmed; this was now becoming pressing.

Mr Heywood added that he hoped to hear from the consultant who would advise on organisational structure, in the near future.

The Secretary undertook to obtain as much information as possible at the HR Forum meeting on 14 February. She felt that the decision to reissue new contracts for existing staff, based on current conditions, would send a positive message.

Mr Bambridge felt that the group should extend its terms of reference to include PCL organisational structure and staff requirements. Mr Heywood said that he was happy to discuss this with his Group.

The next meeting was scheduled for 5 March, following the Board meeting.

FINANCE & GENERAL PURPOSE

The Working Group had met the previous afternoon. The Chairman, Mr Cruickshank said that, having consulted Mr Bennett, the AHDB interim Finance Manager, his view was that there were three aspects which needed clarification:

- Operational issues, such as structures and mechanisms to ensure a seamless transition;
- Confirmation of true costs, particularly those of the relocation, and how they would impact on budgets; and
- The ongoing financial relationship between AHDB and PCL.

Mr Cruickshank asked Steve Moore, the BPC's Head of Finance & IT, to report on a number of practical issues. Mr Moore said that the AHDB finance group, which met regularly, had adopted a pragmatic approach to matters within its brief, aimed at 'business as usual'.

VAT – There would be a group registration for all sector companies.

Finance system – The MLC's computer system was the best one and would be retained by AHDB, at least initially.

Bank accounts - These would be in the name of AHDB, with relevant sector co designation; investment accounts would be managed by each company.

Payroll - This would continue unchanged.

The PCL logo would appear on all legal/finance type documents.

Corporation tax – There were ongoing issues and AHDB were taking specialist advice to ensure that levy payers were not disadvantaged.

Issues discussed

The BPC's CEO presented a summary of key issues discussed the previous day. The Group had had the benefit of attendance from Mr Bennett, and Mr Roberts had also been available to clarify certain issues.

The overarching message was that the potato sector would not be disadvantaged by the transition and should benefit financially in the longer term. The group had been assured that the business case was based on conservative costs (e.g. full provision for current rental commitments), so savings should be achievable. BPC/PCL reserves were ring-fenced.

Costs and savings

The PCL budget for Year 1 (April 08 – March 09) had already been agreed. The relocation package which had been negotiated with Advantage West Midlands (AWM) included a grant and any costs incurred by AHDB would be funded from that. The planned move to Stoneleigh would take place at some point during Year 2 (April 2009 – March 2010). There were projected cost savings arising from lower property costs and operational efficiencies, which would fund the transition.

There were sectoral differences in redundancy terms and, for the sake of fairness, the costs of any severance arising directly from the transition would be funded centrally by AHDB. Any redundancies flowing from decisions taken by PCL would be the responsibility of the company, as would the redundancy provision post-transfer. The group had agreed that this was a

positive and fair way of dealing with the issue.

Whereas savings were projected for the longer term, there would be cash flow shortages in the interim period, and AHDB intended to cover these by borrowing against sector reserves. Any lost interest would be repaid to the sector companies. AHDB would take the risk and would be entitled to any rewards, such as additional income from property sub-letting or early release from lease commitments.

The AHDB business case promised cost savings of £12.7m across the organisation over five years. However, these would not filter down to individual company level until the transition costs had been fully paid for. It was unlikely that any real savings would be realised before 2011/12. Mr Cruickshank said it was important for the Board to have a clear understanding of what was quite a complex issue, as numerous questions would be raised during the levy payer communication project.

Mr Vermont pointed out that cost savings projected over that length of time were likely to be eroded by inflation, increased building costs and so forth. Mrs Fell said that whereas the AHDB finance team took an optimistic view, the working group had adopted a more realistic stance, cautioning against relying on the hoped for savings. She recommended that Mr Roberts should be invited to present a thorough explanation of the business case, to equip members with the factual information they needed to answer questions clearly and with confidence.

Services

Members agreed that the most important things were continuity of service and levy payer support for PCL activities. Clear and positive messages would need to be developed for the *dialogue*. It was understood that AHDB intended to recruit a communications manager, but that PCL would be expected to retain responsibility for communicating with its own levy payers.

Mr Cruickshank said that the Working Group would explore these issues in more depth at its next meeting. Mr Tapp accepted an invitation to join the Group.

The Chair, referring to comments made earlier in the meeting, said that she would invite Mr Roberts to address the Board on the subject of the AHDB business case.

Chair

MARKETING (DOMESTIC & OVERSEAS)

Mr Vermont reported that the Working Group on marketing had held its first meeting the previous evening, and reviewed the

marketing strategy. Kathryn Race and Mark Prentice had been at the meeting.

Mr Chris Bones, the independent AHDB member with responsibility for the marketing sub-committee, had been unable to attend but Mr Vermont had had a very useful telephone conversation with him. Mr Bones had a background in HR and his review encompassed organisational structure as well as opportunities for collaborative activities, particularly in terms of procurement. He was also examining the scope for an industry wide quality assurance scheme, which was a massive undertaking. It seemed clear from the information given by Mr Bones that his work would not impinge on the BPC/PCL marketing strategy; crises and issues management and PR activities would remain sector specific.

Mr Vermont said that the Marketing Strategy Committee was holding its next meeting in Peterborough on Tuesday 26 February. Several major industry companies were represented on the Committee, at senior level, but there were relatively few grower representatives. He invited fellow members to attend.

Mr Worth and Mr Bradley have subsequently joined the Marketing Strategy Committee. See Annex 1.

LEVY PAYER COMMUNICATIONS

Mr Tapp said that the Working Group had not yet met formally, but it had agreed its terms of reference, which were presented to the Board. The functions of the Group were:

- To oversee the inputs to levy payer communication from the other working groups and BPC/PCL staff.
- To recommend and promulgate the initial messages.
- To oversee the *levy payer dialogue* across the whole industry.
- To make recommendations to the PCL Board as a result of the *dialogue*.

Mr Tapp said that he had consulted the CEO of AHDB and it was clear from the feedback that they would need to be kept informed, to avoid confusion or mixed messages, but apart from that, they would adopt a hands off approach.

The Working Group was now awaiting messages. Mrs Priestley, referring to the discussion at the previous Board meeting, asked members to let her have a list of the organisations and

individuals they wished to include in the dialogue; that would start the process. In response to questions about the website, Mrs Priestley said that there would be an AHDB site with links to the individual sector company sites. Members

Mrs Race reported that she had met levy payers the previous week and had come away with the message that they were expecting to see value for money.

MARKET INTELLIGENCE

Mr Scott reported that this Working Group would meet in conjunction with the next meeting of the Market Information Committee. Dr Alder had prepared a list of items which would be discussed.

Mrs Priestley said that one issue, which had been raised by the Staff Working Group, was that whereas there were AHDB sub-committees looking at marketing and R&D, there did not seem to be a similar review of market information; furthermore, this was one of the functions which it had been announced would be centralised. The Chair said that she had raised this with AHDB and been advised that there were no immediate plans for a review.

One issue which the Working Group had been asked to consider was that of charging for statistical information and services. Other levy bodies applied charges but the BPC had made an informed decision not to do so, following an industry review. Mr Tapp promised to put Mr Scott in touch with some industry players in the meat sector who did pay for information and considered that they received value for their money. Mr Tapp suggested that the concept of market failure was relevant when considering whether PCL should introduce a charging policy.

R&D/KT

Mrs Fell said that the Working Group would meet after the Board meeting and would circulate its notes as soon as possible.

The Chair thanked members and staff for their contributions to the Working Groups.

08/26 FINANCE DIRECTORS' FORUM: NOTES OF MEETING (PCP/08/13)

The Board received the notes of the meeting held on 18 January 2008.

08/27 LEVY BODY REVIEW: REPORT OF PROJECT BOARD MEETING

The Secretary said that the project board had met on 16 January and considered a number of issues relating to the change process. Most of these had subsequently changed, been resolved or moved on, demonstrating that things were happening fairly quickly. One positive aspect was that all the State Aids submissions had been approved, so that matter was now resolved.

08/28 PCL BRANDING

The Board received a presentation from the Marketing Director and made the following decisions:

- The Potato Council logo was approved.
- A decision on whether to adopt a mission statement would be made once the *levy payer dialogue* project had been completed.
- Rather than discarding existing BPC materials for consumers, these would be used up by the end of the summer 2008.
- Various booklets and suchlike produced for levy payers, would be marked up with a sticker explaining the change in status.
- A 'gesture pack' of items showing the new branding would be prepared for staff.

08/29 STATUTORY INSTRUMENT (S.I.)(PCP/08/18)

The Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board Order of 2008, which would govern the operations of AHDB and its subsidiaries, was going through the Parliamentary process and, although there had been a delay (for purely technical reasons) in the Scottish Parliament, DEFRA were confident that this would not jeopardise the date of vesting day, 1 April 2008.

The Secretary went through the Paper, highlighting those aspects which were relevant to the potato sector and, in particular, how these varied from the current legislation.

The Board agreed the following:

- Proposals for dealing with information about levy payers, and

services attached thereto, would be considered at the next meeting.

- PCL would use the new power to charge the higher levy rate where plantings/tonnages had been estimated (i.e. where proper returns had not been received); this would be applied at the time when levy invoices were produced.

- An explanatory booklet, including the S.I., notes of guidance and standard forms would be produced, covering those parts of the legislation which related to and were specific to potatoes. Members decided that this document would be produced in pdf format for posting on the PCL website and would only be made available in printed format on request.

The S.I. contained a list of the functions which AHDB was permitted to carry out, and this was annexed to the Paper. Members noted that AHDB could carry out these activities itself or delegate them to its subsidiaries. It was assumed that this would be specified in the 'Delegation Agreement', which was still awaited.

08/30 PCL CRITICAL TIMINGS (PCP/08/14)

The Board received the updated reference document. See *Annex 2*.

08/31 FREQUENCY, DATES & VENUES OF BOARD MEETINGS (PCP/08/15)

The Board noted the Paper, which listed the agreed PCL meetings, and decided the following:

- The meeting scheduled for 4 June 2008, which clashed with the West Midlands Potato Day, would be cancelled.
- Meetings would be held at Oxford unless otherwise agreed.
- Members would inform the Secretary if they wished to propose any alternative venues.

Members

08/32 INFORMATION PAPER: CROP LOSS (PCP/08/16)

In September 2007, the BPC had decided not to introduce a facility for crop loss levy relief; this was in line with the recommendation of the Shadow Sector Company. The issue had now been raised again, by growers in Herefordshire, leading to media reports. The Paper comprised:

- recent correspondence between BPC and NFU;

- a summary of the rationale for the Council's decision; and
- an extract from the relevant BPC minute

The Board took note of the information.

08/33 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to discuss.

08/34 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Potatoes Shadow Sector Board would be held in Oxford, at 8.30 AM on Wednesday 5 March 2008.

Working Group meetings were scheduled as follows

R&D/KT – 8 AM on Thursday 21 February, at Peterborough

Finance Group – 2 PM on Tuesday 4 March, at Oxford

Staff Group – Wednesday 5 March, following the Board meeting

Market Intelligence Group – 2 PM on Wednesday 12 March, at Wansford

Meeting 06/02/08

PCM0802 AUTHORISED

POTATO COUNCIL LTD: FUNCTIONAL COMMITTEES

<p>Marketing Strategy Committee Members</p> <p>Nick Vermont (Chair) Colin Bradley Tim Papworth Fraser Scott Duncan Worth Dave Audley Pepe Bascetta Mark Rowe Bill Bartlett Ronnie Bartlett Graeme Beattie Anthony Carroll Richard Harris Alan Owens Nick Twell Janet Bainbridge (ex officio)</p>	<p>R & D Committee Members</p> <p>Fiona Fell (Chair) Alex Stephens Duncan Worth Simon Bowen Graeme Byers Paul Coleman Graham Finn Richard Harris David Nelson Alistair Redpath Mark Taplin Mark Taylor</p> <p>Janet Bainbridge (ex officio) <u>Invitees:</u></p> <p>Laura Pleasants (DEFRA) Kevin O'Donnell (Scottish Govt)</p>
<p>Date of next meeting: 26 February 2008</p>	<p>Date of next meeting: 21 February 2008</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are also a number of advisory groups eg. Education, NCW, Research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are also a number of advisory groups eg. Blight, Water, Soils, Storage.
<p>Market Information Committee Members</p> <p>Fraser Scott) Joint Chairs Richard Harris) Colin Bradley Richard Maddocks Richard Ash Robert Baird Richard Clark</p> <p>Martin Cockerill Ralph Day Graham Finn Robert Loxton Arnold Peacock John Pettinger Stephen Uttridge</p>	<p>Seed & Export Committee Members</p> <p>Robert Doig (Chair) Jim Cruickshank Graham Nichols David Rankin Gareth Baird James Foskett Charles Gray Tim Halliwell Douglas Harley Alistair Melrose Peter Pattrick Alistair Redpath Ron Reiss David Scott</p>

ANNEX 1 TO PCM/08/02

Des Yarham

Janet Bainbridge (ex officio)

Date of next meeting: 12 March 2008

Janet Bainbridge (ex officio)

Date of next meeting: 28 February 2008

Potato Council Limited Critical Timings

This timetable was adopted by the Board at its meeting on 9 January 2008. It will be reviewed at subsequent meetings, to check progress against plans, and to add items as the process develops.

Levy Payer Dialogue refers to the process of consulting the industry on the PCL Corporate Plan.

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| January 08 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Working Groups set up – Agree terms of reference and set out plans. ✓ ▪ PCL makes decision regarding formal committees on R&D, Marketing, MI, SSG and audit. ✓ |
| February 08 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Working Groups report back to PCL Board. ✓ ▪ PCL Branding is agreed. ✓ |
| March 08 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Working Groups submit final inputs regarding Levy Payer Dialogue to Board. ▪ Dialogue plan documentation finalised. |
| April 08 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statutory transfer to AHDB and start of PCL. ▪ PCL Business Plan 08/09 starts. ▪ PCL Levy Payer Dialogue commences. ▪ Levy Payer communication regarding PCL can begin. |
| June 08 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCL Board members take active role in Levy Payer Dialogue (April to June). |
| July 08 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCL three month Levy Payer Dialogue ends. |
| August 08 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCL considers results of the project. ▪ Marketing / R&D/ MI Working Groups fold. |
| September 08 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Business Plan for 09/10 prepared. |

- December 08
 - PCL submits levy rate proposals to AHDB.

- April 09
 - (Original co-location date).
 - Business Plan for 09/10 commences.

- Summer 09
 - Likely time for co- and re-location.

February 08