

## UK PIN Steering Group Ad Hoc Telephone Conference Held on Friday 12 April 2013

**Present:** David Edgar (DE: Chair)  
D Kumararatne (DSK)  
Richard Herriot (RH)  
Berne Ferry (BF)  
Sara Marshall (SM)  
Paul Williams (PW)  
Aarn Huissoon (AH)  
Emily Carne (EC)  
Olga Bryce (OB)

1.	<b>Apologies</b>	<b>Action</b>
	Apologies were received from Gavin Spickett, Fran Ashworth, Lucia Russell, Terry Flood, Claire Bethune, Matthew Buckland, Helen Baxendale, Sary Workman and Scott Hackett.	
2.	<b>Background to proposal for establishment of legal status of UKPIN</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>DE reviewed the background to our current discussions with BSI.</p> <p><b>a. Need to employ staff</b></p> <p>In the absence of legal status, there were difficulties with direct employment of staff e.g. Cathy Bangs/Olga Bryce and David Guzman were all employed indirectly via/through 3<sup>rd</sup> parties.</p> <p><b>b. Need to raise sponsorship</b></p> <p>Whilst we had been successful in raising sponsorship both from sponsors and government bodies, the lack of legal status made it difficult, on occasion, to receive funds. Kumar pointed out that if UKPIN had a charitable status this would be VAT exempt.</p> <p><b>c. Establish ourselves as an 'official' body, re consultation etc</b></p> <p>It was considered important to have a formally constituted structure, to enable and facilitate consultation with other UK and international partners.</p> <p>At the outset of these discussions in 2012 UKPIN had considered partnerships with a number of organisations, including BSI and ACP as well as pursuing independent or supported status.</p>	

After SWOT analysis within Steering Group, it was decided that BSI was a likely preferred partner with which to engage in discussion, but both BSI and ACP were approached. BSI produced an initial proposal in June 2012 which included baseline and developing office support as well as development of the wider professional relationship. This was put to Steering Group, but there was a long delay in receipt of a response from ACP. At Steering Group meeting held in December 2012 it was agreed to move discussions forward with the BSI. One week subsequent to that, ACP informally indicated that they would be supportive of further developing the relationship with UKPIN.

Judith Willetts (JW), CEO of BSI, produced a more detailed proposal in early 2013 in a document entitled 'UK Immunology Clinical Trials Network'. This document contained structures and responsibilities not previously considered and so it was discussed in more detail with Bill Egner (BE), Chair of CIAS. As a result, DE circulated a simpler proposal suggestion to the BSI. This then triggered some detailed email discussion. As the proposal developed and contained elements not previously discussed with Steering Group, DE consulted with the treasurer and a number of SG members and it was agreed that Steering Group should see the email correspondence, look at the proposals and think again if this was the correct direction of travel for UKPIN.

DE therefore asked the Steering Group for their views on developments thus far.

DSK raised some concerns that the suggested model required UKPIN expenditure to be approved by the BSI board without there being UKPIN representation at that level. RH identified that there appeared to be some conflicts and a lack of clarity and continuity in the various communications with BSI. The proposed structure suggested that UKPIN could be construed as a subsection of the CIAS.

RH identified a number of key areas (1) financial governance and decision-making, and this should be clarified in discussion. (2) Structure: The first document 'UK Immunology Clinical Trials Network', had one version of an organisational structure, whereas the second document 'Draft UKPIN Constitution version 4, page 7' had a different organisational structure. In his view, the latter structure was preferable.

DE agreed with this and indicated that in discussion with BE it had been suggested the CIAS and the

	<p>UKPIN Chairs would probably alternate the Clinical seat on the BSI Board. However, paper versions of proposed organisational structures from BSI indicated that UKPIN would be a subsection of CIAS and would relate to the Board through the Chair of the CIAS. This left an issue to be resolved in that UKPIN expenditure would have to be approved by the Board on which UKPIN was not necessarily represented. This was regarded by the Steering group as a significantly problematic issue.</p> <p>In addition, DE had become increasingly concerned about whether Steering Group support could be secured for the proposals and this was reason for the telephone conference taking place. DE had sent out the papers earlier that day, but appreciated that not everyone would have had a chance to read them and asked again for further and subsequent thoughts of the Steering Group on this and the telephone discussion.</p> <p>There was a full and frank discussion that reflected the disparate view of steering group. Strongly held views were expressed, both for and against further discussions with BSI.</p> <p>The scientific strength of BSI was recognised but specific concerns were expressed, including how UKPIN would relate to CIAS and potential disenfranchisement of nurses and clinical scientists if closer links with BSI were developed</p> <p>DE asked for the Steering Group's advice on how to take discussion forward.</p> <p>It was agreed that the telephone conference had been essential as everyone was not aware of the correspondence from the BSI to UKPIN. All agreed that UKPIN was extremely successful in its defined areas of activity and becoming increasingly so. There was a view that any evolution with BSI needed to be a slow and considered process.</p> <p>It was agreed that, although there were some particular challenges and that strong feelings existed on both sides, further discussions with BSI should be taken forward on behalf of the Steering Group. It was therefore agreed that there should be a further face to face discussion between representatives of BSI and UKPIN Steering Group to clarify all of the issues. DE and RH agreed to take this forward.</p>	
	<p><b>Date of next Steering Group Meeting</b></p>	
	<p>To be decided.</p>	

--	--	--