

**AUTHORISED**

**MINUTES OF THE FIFTEENTH MEETING OF POTATO COUNCIL  
LTD HELD AT NASH COURT, OXFORD ON  
WEDNESDAY 21 JANUARY 2009**

- \* Mr Allan Stevenson - 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

By invitation: Prof Chris Bones, Independent AHDB Member  
(Item 09/08) Mr Kevin Roberts, AHDB CEO  
Mr Richard MacDonald, Director General of NFU

In attendance: Mrs Helen Priestley, CEO  
Mrs Inga Martin, Company Secretary  
Dr Mike Storey, R&D Director  
Mrs Kathryn Race, Marketing Director

**ACTIONS****09/01 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Messrs Bambridge, Bradley, Doig, Rankin, Stephens and Scott.

**09/02     DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interests.

**09/03     MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD HELD ON 3  
DECEMBER 2008 (PCLM/08/10)**

The Minutes of the Board meeting held on 3 December 2008, which had been circulated, were approved and signed as a true record.

**09/04     MATTERS ARISING (PCLP/09/01)**

**Appointment of Directors etc: notifications from Companies House**

Certain documents emanating from Companies House had been of poor quality. In response to a complaint, an apologetic letter had been received, with an assurance that the problem had been rectified and that this did not impact on the details held on the public file.

**Marketing Issues: EU Grant opportunity (Minute 08/193)**

The matter would be followed up before the end of the month.

**Cross charging/Cost allocation (Minute 08/193)**

The issue had been highlighted and would be included on the agenda for the AHDB project board meeting on 29 January. It was important that allocations were based on actual costs, rather than the Accenture business case.

**IT issues (Minute 08/195)**

A new server had been ordered; this was an AHDB funded acquisition.

**Date and venue for July 2009 Board meeting**

It was agreed to retain Thursday 16 July as the date for the meeting but to hold this in London, rather than Edinburgh. This would enable Members to attend an AHDB event scheduled for 15 July.

**09/05     OPERATIONAL SUMMARY: REPORT FROM THE CEO  
(PCLP/09/02)**

The Chief Executive presented a report on a range of management and operational issues, including departmental highlights.

**Stoneleigh Accommodation**

Preparations of the temporary accommodation were continuing apace

and AHDB were confident that all would be ready for relocation as planned; the PCL move was timetabled for late July 2009.

### **IT Systems**

At its previous meeting, the Board had learnt that migration of the IT systems would be achieved by creating a virtualised network, which was a system of “safe duplication”. This process was now well advanced: HGCA and HDC had been successfully and seamlessly converted and PCL would follow suit by the end of January. In preparation for this, staff had devoted a day to clearing out and archiving obsolete documents; valuable computer space had been reclaimed this way, so the effort had been worthwhile.

### **Paper archives**

Documents which, for legal and regulatory reasons, could not be destroyed would be prepared for transfer to Stoneleigh. Most of these would be processed onto the PCL’s EDRM system, known as Cyclops. AHDB had not yet decided whether to adopt this, or some other, “paperless” application.

The Board was pleased to hear that these practical aspects were on target.

### **Fresh Potato Suppliers Group**

The Board noted that PCL had facilitated the first meeting of this group which, the CEO believed, would prove a useful forum for discussing issues of common interest. Mr Worth, who had attended the meeting, concurred.

### **CUPGRA**

The R&D Director had given a presentation at the annual CUPGRA conference and reported positive feedback. The Board was pleased to note that PCL-funded work had been given due recognition at the event which, in turn, had resulted in positive PCL-branded media coverage.

### **Open Farm Sunday**

The CEO reported that PCL had declined a request from LEAF for a financial contribution to this campaign, but had instead offered to communicate the events to levy payers.

### **Departmental Highlights**

The CEO’s summary contained reports on activities and issues from each of the PCL functions, many of which were augmented by reports from Group Chairs and staff later in the meeting.

The Board noted the report.

**09/06 RELOCATION: STAFF ISSUES (PCLP/09/16)**

The Board received an update on staff issues pertaining to the ongoing reorganisation and relocation programme.

**09/07 AHDB ISSUES: CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

The next meeting of the AHDB Board was scheduled for Friday 23 January. The Chairman gave an outline of the issues to be considered at that meeting, in particular property matters and common branding for quality schemes.

**Property acquisition**

At its previous meeting, the AHDB Board had given favourable consideration to the idea of purchasing the land and building to be constructed at Stoneleigh, rather than enter into a lease. There were a number of factors relating to the current financial climate, which made ownership a more attractive solution.

The Chairman said that this could provide an opportunity for the sector companies to invest some of their reserves in the property. The matter would be considered further at the meeting on 23 January and a detailed paper would then be presented to the PCL Board.

Chairman

**09/08 COMMON BRANDING FOR QUALITY SCHEMES: SUPPORTING THE RED TRACTOR LOGO (RTL)**

The Board had received a number of papers relating to this topic:

- AHDB Proposal ([PCLP/09/05](#))
- Chairman's Position ([PCLP/09/15](#))
- What PCL Activities can be funded by £60K ([PCLP/09/19](#))
- PCL Autonomy of Decision-making ([PCLP/09/12](#))
- AHDB Response to Green Paper on Quality Schemes ([PCLP/09/13](#))

**Background**

The Chairman reminded the meeting that proposals for introducing a common quality assurance brand for GB agriculture had been under discussion by AHDB for some time and, more recently, this had become focused on providing support for the existing RTL scheme managed by Assured Food Standards (AFS). The financial contributions requested for promotional activities, across all sectors, totalled £500K, of which PCL would be asked to make available £63K.

The PCL Board had debated the matter at previous meetings, when the following broad principles were agreed:

- Any collaborative marketing activities of benefit to the potato sector would be welcomed and embraced, but Members did not see that a common quality marque would help achieve that;
- There was a clear distinction between an all-embracing production quality scheme, the merits of which were easily understood, and a quality brand used for marketing purposes, where the benefits were much less easy to discern. It was noted that the Board did not view the Red Tractor as a brand.

The amount requested would be a major financial commitment for the potato sector and Members had felt unable to make a decision until they had received more specific proposals as to how the money would be applied.

Mr Roberts and Dr Bones, AHDB CEO and Independent member respectively, had accepted an invitation to address the January meeting. They were accompanied by Mr MacDonald, Director General of the NFU.

### **Presentations**

Dr Bones, who had led the AHDB review of a single quality scheme for agriculture from the beginning, gave a brief summary of the process. There had been engagement with retailers, pressure groups, industry representatives and consumers. This had demonstrated that RTL was the only scheme which was widely recognised. However, it did not have a strong, unified message and consumers were confused about what the logo stood for. What the consumer wanted was safety and an assurance of quality, which could be strengthened by a message about provenance.

Dr Bones recognised that there were sectoral variations, for instance in terms of import penetration which was more prevalent in the meat sector than for potatoes; and there was a risk of problems such as health scares in one sector having an adverse effect on other RTL logoed products. However, he strongly believed that these issues were far outweighed by the longer term benefits of having one single overarching brand which was reinforced to the consumer at every purchase. The current structure of RTL and AFS needed to be addressed, urgently. Collective action across the industry, underpinned by a financial commitment, was key.

Mr MacDonald, who had been involved in the RTL project since its inception, firmly believed that growers wanted a single set of standards. Currently there were many, but Assured Produce – whose aims were coherence, strength and harmonisation - was the cornerstone of them all. AFS had done a great job, despite

limited resources, as evidenced by the fact that the RTL logo appeared on products worth £8 billion. However, the benefits were starting to evaporate due to lack of positive reinforcement and, furthermore, the Defra grant which had been provided to start the project, was coming to an end. Hence, there was an urgent need for new funding.

Mr MacDonald said that the proposals for investment were aimed at two levels: firstly to defend what had already been achieved in terms of market penetration, in the face of increasing costs and reduced central funding; and secondly to develop the brand further through increased promotional activity, to improve consumer understanding. The NFU owned the RTL brand, which they would hand over to AFS, free of charge, subject to certain assurances.

The Chairman thanked the visitors for their presentations and opened up the discussion by inviting members' comments and questions.

### **Discussion**

Mr Tapp suggested that there was a significant lack of clarity between a broad-based assurance scheme and a consumer facing quality brand. He felt that the difference had not been articulated in the proposals and asked how AHDB would seek to define value.

Mr Roberts responded that the proposal needed State Aid approval as a "quality scheme", so in EU terms assurance schemes and quality brands were deemed to be synonymous. This chimed with the message from the consultation that consumers equated safety and quality. That would not preclude the possibility of building additional quality factors into the arrangement, and some sectors might wish to do so.

Mrs Fell asked whether a surcharge on the participants of the RTL scheme, as an alternative to levy body funding, had been explored. Mr MacDonald felt that such an arrangement, which would be a mixture of voluntary and compulsory contributions, would be difficult to set up and unlikely to be acceptable to the industry. Importantly, the principle of *market failure* applied, hence central funding was deemed more appropriate. Mrs Priestley, referring to the division of costs between the sector companies, suggested that it would be fairer to weight the contributions according to perceived value. Dr Bones felt that a straight split based on relative incomes was the least complex and most equitable solution; however, it could be done differently.

The point had been made that, provided State Aid approval was granted to the scheme, RTL could be a means of using national

provenance as a secondary message in promotions; the research had shown that this was a positive factor for consumers. Mr Heywood asked whether the logo could be used by foreign competitors, albeit with representations of their national flags. Mr Roberts confirmed that this would be permissible, as it was now. Mr MacDonald said that was not seen as a threat. Anyone wishing to take part had to comply with the requirements of the scheme and other countries had their own arrangements. On the subject of EU grant opportunities, Mr Roberts said that anyone obtaining European money would have to promote European products.

### **Branding and quality**

Mr Vermont said that he had fully supported RTL from the start, as a food assurance scheme. He recognised that in sectors where it was important to be able to demonstrate good farming practice, it had a stronger role. Elsewhere, as in the case of potatoes, such practices were a given and here he saw the logo as a hygiene factor rather than a motivator. He considered that RTL would never become a consumer facing brand, by which he meant *consistent delivery of a promise*; it did not denote 'better'.

Mr MacDonald agreed, but made the point that, as a food assurance scheme, RTL was an important consumer facing marque. Demonstrating as it did that foods showing the logo had been produced to certain standards, it did have an element of differentiation – which had a value for consumers. It was important not to exaggerate this but to be clear about what the standards were. Individual sectors could then add values as they wished.

### **Efficiencies**

Mr Papworth referred to the proliferation of assurance schemes, which meant duplication of paperwork and procedures, making compliance very time-consuming. He asked whether there were any plans for lessening this burden. Mr MacDonald said that AFS were actively engaged in proposals for harmonising such activities; this was work in progress.

Mr Cruickshank warned that funding the scheme through the levy bodies might be perceived as an underhand practice - taking the soft option – rather than addressing the issue of direct industry funding. He asked whether AHDB saw this as a pump-priming exercise or ongoing support for an inefficient system.

Mr Roberts replied that AFS did not run an inefficient system, but they did need financial support. He reiterated that market failure applied, which warranted central funding through the levy bodies. In response to a question from Mrs Priestley, he said that the

£500K contribution requested from AHDB would be spent in part on policing and enforcement work to protect licensees and in part on consumer PR and other communication activities.

The Chairman pointed out that, currently, PCL staff had to account for every £ of levy income spent, demonstrating that activities were in line with the approved business plan and budget, and that they provided direct benefit to the industry. He asked how AHDB would match this. Mr Roberts promised that equally stringent measures would be applied in monitoring the use of, and benefits from, the investment.

### **Ownership**

Mr Nichols, as an NFU member, asked for a comment about the decision to give away the logo. Mr MacDonald replied that NFU had helped create RTL and had continued to fund it, and, whilst a licence in perpetuity had been granted to AFS, they had retained control over the scheme. It was recognised, however, that so long as it was owned by farmers alone, the scheme would never be an industry asset. They had now decided to hand over ownership, for the benefit of the industry.

Mr Roberts summarised the aims of the proposals for cross-sector funding of RTL:

- defending, and avoiding erosion of, the current market position of the assurance scheme;
- creating a common platform which can be further developed in terms of additional investment and promotion on a sector-specific basis;
- sending a strong signal about AHDB collaboration; and
- demonstrating commitment to the British agriculture industry.

The visitors then left the meeting.

### **Board decision**

After careful consideration, the Board unanimously agreed to support Assured Produce, without reservation, as the principal scheme for farm assurance in British agriculture.

However, a majority of members believed that providing funding for promotion of RTL would not be an appropriate use of levy funded resources in the potato sector, given the priorities identified in its corporate plan and the responses from the sector to the AHDB consultation.

It was proposed by one member that PCL should conduct its own business-to-business and consumer facing promotion of RTL from the existing marketing budget. Such a project would be integrated with existing activities, using in-house expertise, with the aim of raising awareness of the scheme, without losing focus on potato industry priorities. This was a way of softening the 'no' message to the NFU, AFS and AHDB and to demonstrate direct support for the many levy payers in the packing and processing sectors who are RTL licensees.

### **The next step**

The proposals for introducing a common quality assurance brand for GB agriculture through support of RTL would now be considered by the AHDB Board at its meeting on 23 January.

## **09/09 ACTIVITY PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF STORAGE R&D OPTIONS (PCLP/09/03) - Confidential**

At its meeting in December 2008, the Board had considered and approved a plan for reviewing the future of SBEU. A steering group comprising Mrs Fell and Messrs Bambridge, Doig and Worth had been set up to oversee the review and to act as a sounding board.

The CEO reported that, at its first meeting on 14 January, the Group had agreed that developing the existing site at Sutton Bridge was the most effective solution.

The CEO was charged with producing an overarching plan for the business in the form of a frame-work/vision statement. Once this had received the Board's commitment and approval to progress, it would be developed into an operational business plan.

CEO

## **09/10 R&D ISSUES**

Mrs Fell said that the Committee had not met since the previous Board meeting but there were some issues which required Board consideration and approval.

### **Projects**

BBSRC had approved support for a £450K **IPA project (Industrial Partnership Awards)** at Cambridge University (Biochemistry), where PCL contributed 10% of total cost (£45K over 4 financial years). The project looked at the virulence factors (plant cell wall degrading enzymes) causing bacterial rots with the aim of identifying resistance mechanisms and potential anti-rot agents.

**International Diagnostics** collaboration – The Australia/NZ research proposal which was synergistic with the PCL diagnostics project had been submitted to Horticulture Australia and mechanisms to tie the projects together contractually were being investigated. The aim was to ensure that there was effective two-way engagement by the research consortia. As part of this, the complementary studentship looking at powdery scab populations (which had been identified at PS workshop in 2007) had been finalised with a NZ/Switzerland lead tying in with an ongoing SCRI/South Africa collaboration.

The Board noted the updates and approved the expenditure.

**09/11 GM TECHNOLOGY: PROPOSAL FOR PCL FORUM (PCLP/09/04)**

At its December 2008 meeting, the Board had discussed the need to review the PCL position on GM crops and biotechnology, and agreed that an industry seminar, in the form of a technical workshop, would be held in the first quarter of 2009, to review and discuss the challenges and opportunities presented by genetic modification.

The concept had been developed by the R&D Director, who submitted detailed proposals for a one-day event to be run in April or May 2009. The aim was to attract 80 to 100 delegates and a challenging debate could be expected. The intention was to use facilitators, in order to ensure that this had structure and focus.

The output would be an agreed position statement and it was envisaged that the AHDB Chief Scientist (yet to be appointed) would have a role to play in taking this forward.

The Chairman reported that at the Oxford Farming Conference, which he had attended earlier in the month, some 80% of the questions tabled had related to GMOs, indicating that this event was timely.

The proposals were approved. Mr Vermont recommended that staff be prepared for strong media interest.

R&D  
Director

**09/12 NATIONAL CHIP WEEK 2009 (PCLP/09/06)**

The Paper set out full details of plans and preparation for this year's event, which would run from 9 to 13 February. Keith Chegwin had been contracted to act as the NCW Ambassador, a role he had thrown himself into with his usual energy and enthusiasm. Promotion had already commenced and, before the start of the meeting, Members had looked at one TV recording. Mrs Race said that this campaign had really captured the

imagination of consumers, and PCL had been inundated with calls from Chip shops wanting to take part. The project was oversubscribed but callers had been redirected to the website where they could print off promotional materials.

### **09/13 FINANCE REPORT TO 31 DECEMBER 2008 (PCLP/09/07)**

Mr Alan Tullis, who had recently joined PCL as interim Head of Finance & IT, presented financial reports for the period ended 31 December 2008.

The Board noted that, in accordance with AHDB's temporary investment strategy, sector companies were free to make their own investment choices, so long as these were confined to the UK banking sector. PCL used HBOS, which currently gave the best rates.

It was noted that the National Audit Office would audit PCL in early March, with a final audit in late April.

The Board approved the report but asked that two areas of presentation be reviewed:

- That the salary figure be split between salary payments to employees and fees paid to Board Members (which were treated as salaries), which would give better clarity.
- That the practice of spreading the budget evenly throughout the year with actual expenditure reflecting the timing of the spend, be looked at. This was not a conventional accounting practice but one which PCL had inherited from its predecessor. The CEO would look at this with Mr Tullis, to establish whether presenting the figures in a different way would enable the Board to assess performance against budget more easily.

CEO &  
Head of  
Finance

### **09/14 LEVY PAYER RECORDS & COLLECTION REPORT (PCLP/09/08)**

The Board received a report showing matters dealt with and matters still to be resolved, in terms of levy collection and chasing defaulters. *Details are at Annex 1.*

The Board noted that the number of planting returns for 2008 which were still outstanding was considerably lower than the situation the year before. This demonstrated that the Board's policy of applying higher levy rate to estimated levies (i.e. where proper returns had not been made) had been effective. This was one of the powers set out in the new legislation (AHDB Order).

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Secretary said

that staff had so far been able to meet their long established target of collecting 99+% of due levies and that the provision for bad and doubtful debt had traditionally been set at a very low level. However, in view of the current economic downturn, which affected businesses in all industries, this issue needed extra careful vigilance.

The Secretary reported that plans were in place for a promotional campaign to encourage growers to use the electronic planting return. This had been introduced as a small pilot in 2008 – which had been successful – and it was now hoped to roll it out on a large scale. There was scope for major cost savings, for PCL and for the industry, but that depended on a good level of uptake.

**09/15 HYPOTHECATION OF LEVIES: NFU PROPOSALS (PCLP/09/09)**

The Board was advised, at its meeting in December, of a suggestion from the NFU Potatoes Group, that levy payers should be able to hypothecate their levies to specific PCL activities, on an individual basis. The paper explained this idea in some detail.

The Board noted that, in simple administrative terms, this would not be particularly challenging. However, there were other implications such as timescale, weighting of information and fluctuations of functional income, particularly that relating to R&D. Members agreed that there could be positive reasons for taking the suggestion forward, in terms of democracy and accountability, and it might be a useful tool, as part of PCL's robust and well established process of communicating with levy payers. A suggestion from Mr Papworth that this might be linked to the e-return system discussed earlier, received general support.

The Board agreed, following discussion, that the proposal for a system of hypothecating levies put forward by the NFU, merited careful consideration, as part of PCL's communications and business planning processes. In view of the forthcoming relocation and reorganisation which would entail changes both to systems and to staff, it was not feasible to progress this until 2010 at the earliest.

CEO

**09/16 WORLD POTATO CONGRESS (PCLP/09/17)**

The Chairman reminded Members that there was an opportunity for GB to host the World Potato Congress (WPC) in 2012. This had been brought to the attention of the Board through the Seed & Export Committee, which supported the idea in principle. The Paper set out details of the proposal, as requested by the Board.

The CEO said that putting on an event of this size and nature

would be challenging but it could be done, given sufficient resource. She had secured confirmation that CEMS, the firm which had managed the biannual BP events for several years, would assist with preparing the bid to participate, within the available timescale. However, it had to be recognised that, by entering into a contract to host the congress, PCL would be accepting a certain amount of financial risk. In terms of location, it seemed that Scotland would be a suitable choice, given its export connections, both in commercial and institutional terms. The closing date for submitting an application was 31 January 2009, but it was hoped that WPC inc, the owners of the brand, would be prepared to grant an extension.

The Chairman said that he would be attending the forthcoming WPC in New Zealand, in March 2009, which would give him a greater insight into what such an event entailed. Dr Storey was one of the speakers. He favoured the proposal, seeing this as an opportunity for showcasing Scotland, but recognised that more research was required before considering such a major commitment.

Members felt that the opportunity for hosting an event of this nature was something which merited consideration, but there had been insufficient time to research this properly. It was agreed to proceed with gathering more information with a view to making a decision at the Board meeting on 30 April 2009, provided WPC inc were prepared to extend the deadline until then.

CEO

In the meantime, as part of the research, a member of CEMS would attend the WPC in New Zealand, the costs of which would be met by PCL.

*WPC inc have subsequently approved an extension beyond 30 April.*

#### **09/17 PCL SMITH INSTITUTE ESSAY (PCLP/09/18)**

The Board received the Paper. This was part of a set of essays commissioned by the Smith Institute, through AHDB, on the topic of *Feeding Britain*.

#### **09/18 PCL: CRITICAL TIMINGS (PCLP/09/10)**

The Board received the updated reference document, which showed that all actions had been achieved on target. See *Annex 2 to these minutes*.

It was confirmed that these reports, edited as appropriate, were still required.

Secretary

**09/19 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no further business to discuss.

**09/20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed that the next Board meeting of Potato Council Ltd would be held in Stoneleigh, at 8.30 AM on Wednesday 4 March 2009, hosted by the NFU at their offices. The pre-meeting dinner would be held at Chesford Grange Hotel.

Meeting 21 January 2009

PCLM0901



## LEVY PAYER RECORDS AND COLLECTION REPORT

### Civil Matters

This relates to levy collection/ pursuing overdue debts

### Historical

During the BPC's tenure, a total of 6,225 overdue debts were collected, amounting to £6.25m

### Current

We have met the target of collecting at least 99% of all due debts, for each year including 2007 (area and tonnage levy).

The outstanding debts for previous years total £10.9K (growers) and £2.6K (buyers). Currently we have one defended action.

The outstanding balance in respect of 2008 levy debts is £702.5K.

### Criminal Matters

This covers failure to register, failure to make returns or provide information, making false statements

### Historical

During the period from 2001, when such matters were brought in-house:

- 2,200 cases have been dealt with
- 307 levy payers have been summonsed
- 37 have been convicted \*\*

### Current

There are 34 outstanding planting returns for 2008; the statutory return date was 1 June. The figure at a similar date in the previous year was 155.

Court hearing December 2008: All but one grower complied before the hearing; he was convicted and fined.

There are 6 Buyer businesses with one or more outstanding tonnage returns.

\*\* Fines totalling £20,845 have been applied; and the Courts have ordered costs totalling £8,540 to be paid.

Under the previous legislation the maximum fine for most offences was £1000. Under the new Order, all offences carry a maximum fine of £5,000.



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

## ANNEX 2 TO PCLM/09/01

- The other Working Groups (Finance & General Purpose, Staff and Communications) fold ✓
  - Corporate plan for 09/12 prepared ✓
- 1 October 2008
- Corporate plan (draft) presented to PCL Board and AHDB sub-group ✓
  - Consider levy rate proposals & make recommendations to AHDB ✓
  - Agree proposals for sector specific staff complement ✓
  - Commence AHDB staff consultation: collective and individual ✓
- 17 November 2008
- Corporate plan cleared by AHDB Board ✓
- 18 Nov to 22 Dec 2008
- Industry Consultation on Corporate plan ✓
  - Complete AHDB staff consultation ✓
- January 2009
- Corporate plan submitted to Ministers
  - PCL collective staff consultation
- February 2009
- Corporate plan cleared by Ministers
  - PCL individual staff consultation
- March 2009
- Levy rates confirmed
  - Planting returns prepared – with Stoneleigh return address
- 1 April 2009
- Effective date of levy rates for 2009/10
- April 09
- Some functions may co-locate.
  - Business Plan for 09/10 commences.
- 30 June 2009
- Staff redundancy – proposed effective date
- Summer/autumn 09
- Possible time for co- and re-location
  - PCL intended move – second half of July
- Meeting 21 January 2009