

## ROC EVENTS LIMITED

Minutes of board meeting held at the offices of the BIR, 26<sup>nd</sup> June 2017 at 11:00 am

**Present:**

ROC Trustees and Directors

Gunter Dombrowe	(GD)	<i>Chair</i>
Angela Baker	(AB)	<i>President UKRO</i>
Pam Black	(PB)	<i>Vice Chair</i>
Richard Evans	(RE)	<i>Marketing Committee Chair</i>
Maryann Hardy	(MH)	<i>President UKRC</i>
John Kotre	(JKo)	<i>Treasurer</i>
Hugh Wilkins	(HW)	<i>Company Secretary</i>

**In attendance:**

Paul Elbourn	(PE)	<i>Profile Productions UKRO Conference Director</i>
Sue Elcock	(SE)	<i>Profile Productions UKRC Conference Director</i>
Di Gilson	(DG)	<i>Observer (Chair RCR Oncology PLD committee)</i>
Peter Harrison	(PH)	<i>AXREM Chair (agenda items 8-12, in part)</i>
Julian Kabala	(JKa)	<i>President-elect UKRC</i>
Simon Thompson	(ST)	<i>Observer (BIR CEO)</i>
Simon Whitfield	(SW)	<i>Profile Productions Managing Director</i>
Ian Wolstencroft	(IW)	<i>Finance Officer</i>

Minute	Actions	
6.1	<a href="#">Feedback to 'Make Events' re individual who felt excluded from dinner</a>	SE
6.1	<a href="#">Compile feedback from UKRCO2017 &amp; circulate to board mtg attendees</a>	SE
6.4	<a href="#">Explore compatibility of AXREM dinner with RCR entertainment policy</a>	DG
7	<a href="#">Feedback to AXREM members re discussions about AXREM dinner</a>	PH
8	<a href="#">Collate and place bursary-recipient reports on conference website</a>	SE
10	<a href="#">Document bank mandate changes for September meetings</a>	IW
10	<a href="#">Set up file for financial matters for JT and IW common access online</a>	IW
10	<a href="#">Close UKRO bank account</a>	IW
10	<a href="#">Provide new Trustee Annual Report Template for September meeting</a>	IW
10	<a href="#">UKRCO2017 report for September meeting</a>	SE et al
11	<a href="#">Write short paper for ROC Board on employer reimbursement</a>	GD, HW
13.1	<a href="#">Sign contract with Liverpool ACC when it is finalised</a>	SW, GD

Minute	Decisions
6.4	<a href="#">Future contractual arrangements for engagement re press &amp; PR should be clarified</a>
7	<a href="#">Social programme, in particular the AXREM Dinner, will need further review</a>
7	<a href="#">Future of the AXREM/Congress Dinner to be referred to the ROC Board</a>
8	<a href="#">Bursary-recipient reports to be collated and placed on website</a>
10	<a href="#">UKRO bank account to be closed</a>
11	<a href="#">Short paper for ROC board on reimbursement of employers agreed</a>
13.1	<a href="#">Contract with Liverpool ACC for 2018-22 Congresses agreed</a>

## 1. Welcome and introductions

GD welcomed attendees, particularly DG, JKa and ST who were attending for the first time. He announced that John Turner (JT) has accepted the role of Finance Officer in succession to IW, with a good overlap period during which IW and JT will be working side-by-side.

## 2. Apologies for absence

Apologies had been received from Liz Beckmann and John Turner

## 3. Declarations of conflicts of interest

PH noted his role as MD of Siemens Healthcare Ltd.

## 4. Minutes of last meeting (22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017)

The minutes of the meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

## 5. Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda

There were no matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda.

## 6. UKRCO2017 Congress Debrief

### 6.1 Profile Productions

SE reported that the anticipated 'Manchester bubble' which had been expected to result in increased receipts had not materialised – the number of paying delegates was 10 down compared with 2016. 1065 delegates had pre-registered (cf 1033 in 2016) but fewer registered at the Congress. Some who had paid did not turn up. Some people cancelled their bookings because of the terrorist incident in Manchester 3 weeks before UKRCO2017.

The number of day visitors did increase. The total number of delegates plus day visitors on site was 1759 (compared with 1684 in 2016). The total number of people on site (including exhibitors) was 3829 (compared with c3000 in 2016). (The number of exhibitor personnel was similar to the number of delegates plus day visitors.)

Daily delegate attendances were: Monday 1305; Tuesday 1358; Wednesday c1100. The attendance on Wednesday was much better than in 2016.

There was discussion about the impact on radiographer numbers at next year's congress being later than normal, bearing in mind that final year student radiographers will have graduated by then.

Delegates had identified themselves as members of ROC member organisations as follows: BIR (79); SCoR (477); IPEM (43); RCR (236) (with some people being members of more than one of the member organisations).

SE gave preliminary feedback on the approximately 400 evaluation forms received. Feedback was generally very good. The plenary sessions were well-received, particularly Robert Winston's closing plenary, which was judged the conference highlight by the largest group for that question.

Feedback about the exhibition was generally good. The AXREM dinner had very favourable feedback, apart from one person who said she had not had a seat (on the seating plan), was given a table on her own, felt out of place not being part of industry and left early. SE said she would pass this back to 'Make Events' (AXREM dinner organisers). There was good feedback about the UKRCO dinner, though one critic of the choice of disco music.

**Action SE**

Most responders indicated that they would be interested in attending next year, though a couple noted that holding it in July was too late. 88% said that the Congress offered value for money. Organisation of the Congress was praised. The flash sale was popular with beneficiaries but had not resulted in an increased number of delegates. About 300 people booked during the flash sale but it led to reduced income. 363 people attended who had not been to previous UKRC/UKRO meetings. Verbal feedback on the flexi-ticket was that it was quite difficult to book (it couldn't be booked online) – it was felt that it could be advertised better. The conference bag, which pays for itself from fees for exhibitor inserts, was popular. SE said she would compile and circulate the feedback.

**Action SE**

## **6.2 AXREM Chair**

PH commented on the movable back screen layout which complicated comparisons with previous exhibitions but said that the exhibition had felt a bit emptier. SE reported that there had been 119 exhibition stands at UKRCO2017. PE compared this with 108 stands in 2016. Several people commented that there had been good networking during the exhibition.

PE provided comparative data on exhibition space sold: 2165 m<sup>2</sup> (2017) compared with 1869 m<sup>2</sup> (2016). 35 of the stands this year were from new exhibitors. Some of the bigger companies had taken considerably less space whilst others had taken more.

AXREM have not analysed the impact on exhibition engagement of the experimental staggering/synchronisation of session timings. The satellite symposia had seemed busier than in previous years, though the feedback format meant that the perceived success of the symposia was not fully reflected in the feedback (opportunity to identify just one congress highlight; day visitor symposia attendance but not asked to provide feedback).

There was mixed feedback from the UKRO community, including a level of dissatisfaction from some exhibitors. They felt more integrated this year, and there had been more footfall at stands, but with only 7%-8% of delegates being radiotherapy/oncology, and a smaller percentage of day visitors, it had been harder for UKRO exhibitors. SW added that this was compounded by delegates spreading their time between 119 exhibitors rather than the typical 30 stands at UKRO, a source of frustration for some exhibitors. There was discussion about the reduced number of UKRO delegates and competition from other conferences, particularly the timing of ESTRO.

(Retrospective note on dates of ESTRO meetings: ESTRO2016 29 April – 3 May 2015; ESTRO2017 (Vienna) 5-9 May 2017; ESTRO2018 (Barcelona) 20-24 April 2018. A new ESTRO venture, the 1st ESTRO Physics Workshop, is being held in Glasgow 17-18 Nov 2017 – HW)

HW had received a phone call from Liz Beckmann (LB) in which she expressed concern about UKRO, in particular the risk of exhibitors not supporting future congresses and the falling number of UKRO delegates.

### **6.3 UKRC President**

MH commented that the UKRC team had gelled well and provided a programme with a good variety of topics. It had been helpful firming up the plenary sessions at an early stage. She had been somewhat disappointed with the debate this year. Previewing the posters had been successful and had helpfully picked up in advance some posters being landscape rather than the specified portrait orientation.

She reported mixed views on the staggered/synchronised timings of sessions and their impact on exhibition attendance. Media engagement needs to be taken forward. Scientific content had reverted to normal following criticism that it had fallen the previous year. There have been adverse comments about the informatics sessions on social media. The outgoing vice-president (informatics) has sent an email saying that informatics was being removed from the Congress. This is a source of concern as informatics is central to radiology. MH proposed that there be an informatics “day” next year, and that this be promoted on the website to counter misinformation noted above.

Further work is needed to take forward education on the stands. MH proposed that she take on a role as past-president supporting better integration of industry within the congress. GD commented that such integration is in line with views expressed in recent ROC/ROC-E meetings, and that there needs to be evolution from informatics being seen as an IT niche entity – it is more than PACS. He proposed the term ‘analytics’ rather than ‘informatics’ and suggested a half-page description.

There was discussion about the development of informatics/analytics in radiology, including reservations about involvement of IT giants such as Microsoft and Google and potentially greater involvement of smaller IT companies.

### **6.4 UKRO President**

AB referred to positive emails about the recent congress. She anticipates that most of the UKRO committee will stay the same for 2018. There had been unfortunate timetabling

clashes during the last session on the Wednesday afternoon, coupled with reduced delegate numbers after lunch. She asked if the 2018 congress would again end at 3:30pm – SE saying that this had not yet been fixed. AB echoed the view that there had been no clear answer to the question about staggered breaks.

There was discussion about the eponymous lectures. It is getting harder to fit them all in (exacerbated with RCR lectures from 2019). It was unfortunate that one of these lectures, given by an authority in the field, clashed with a session on topics of particular interest to many of those who would otherwise have attended his talk. There had been complaints that another lecture had essentially been a repeat of the same lecture given elsewhere in the programme.

It was suggested that eponymous lecturer/lecturers could be identified from the programme as it is being put together, linked to the conference theme. The plenary sessions are pencilled-in early in the process (~September), with the outline time grid completed by ~Christmas. Eponymous lectures have sometimes not been added to the programme until as late as March.

UKRO delegates had referred in feedback to the loss of the UKRO dinner.

SE noted that Dominic Deeson<sup>1</sup> had been asked to take forward press & PR communications but this had not led to anything apart from a press release about the schools' session which had been picked up by one local paper. In future years terms of engagement, with agreed payment and expected outcomes, should be clarified at the outset.

## 7. UKRO Exhibitors

The enlarged Presidents' reception was deemed successful (with a comment about the risqué content of one of the speeches). The AXREM dinner had been popular, though AH had queried whether it is compatible with RCR's entertainment policy. GD invited DG to explore this with AH before further review.

**Action DG**

There is also the question of access to the AXREM dinner, with persistent requests for more tickets. The anomaly of a simultaneous event attended by 90 people was noted. PH noted that companies subsidise the AXREM dinner. GD suggested that additional tickets for it be made available for purchase, at a price acknowledged to discounted by AXREM subsidy. There was discussion about organisation, history and attendance at a congress dinner, and the concept of some delegates attending free at an industry-sponsored congress dinner. Branding was agreed to be an important issue, particularly bearing in mind UKRO tradition. It was agreed that the AXREM dinner and the question of a congress dinner would go the ROC board.

PH agreed to communicate the outcome of this discussion to AXREM members. It was noted that the ROC-E board considered this year's AXREM Dinner "an excellent event".

**Action PH**

---

<sup>1</sup> Publisher at Deeson Group Ltd (<https://www.deeson.co.uk/>)

## **8. Preparations for UKRCO 2018**

JKa commented that key issues had already been brought up in the debrief. Much of the team will be kept together, but there will be some changes, including informatics. Emerging issues which will need to be looked at include nuclear medicine, with comments received about insufficient content to attract attendees from the nuclear medicine community. There was also scope for discussion about whether or not there should be separate radiographer sessions. He noted there had been empty places at the AXREM dinner.

GD invited open discussion on the question of sessions being streamed, particularly with regard to radiographer sessions. MH referred to integration being a key strength of UKRC and felt that segregated sessions could weaken the essence of the congress. That said, she recognized that some radiographers had called for a greater identity within the congress, and stressed the importance of multidisciplinary representation on the organising committee. There is scope for aiming some sessions towards people specialist to a greater or lesser extent, or having different levels of expertise (expert/novice) in a particular topic.

A comment was made that people will not want to sit through a session in which only one of the presentations is of interest to them. A counter view was expressed that the programme allows people to move in and out during sessions. RE commented that the marketing of the event, emphasizing its multidisciplinary nature, is important.

There was discussion about the bursary scheme. One person had received bursaries in successive years, an oversight. HW asked that bursary recipient reports be made available. It was agreed that they be collated and placed in the committee portal on the website.

**Action SE**

## **9. Learning and ideas for future Congresses**

This item was conflated with item 8 – see above.

## **10. Finance matters**

JKo reported that financial details (of the 2017 congress) were being worked on by Profile. JT had attended UKRCO2017 and is being integrated into the finance officer role. IW noted the need for bank mandate changes, and will provide updates at the September meetings.

**Action IW**

A common file for financial matters is being set up which both JT and IW can access online.

**Action IW**

IW asked if the UKRO Unity bank account should be closed and this was agreed.

**Action IW**

He reminded people of the expenses protocol: officers of the board are reimbursed by ROC/ROC-E; UKRCO presidents are reimbursed by the event; representatives of member organisations are reimbursed by the member organisations. He noted a change of format for the Trustees Annual Report and Financial Statement this year and will provide further information for the 26.9.17 meetings.

**Action IW**

SE said that Profile will be working on the financial report of the 2017 congress during August and will produce a report for the September meeting.

**Action SE et al**

## **11. Financial reimbursement to employers of officers' time**

This item refers to the question of financial compensation for the amount of time taken by people undertaking committee work etc to support the Congress. Whilst charity trustees cannot receive payments, maybe there needs to be some payment to their employers.

MH noted that as an academic she has more flexibility in this regard than clinical staff, and felt there is a risk that we may lose people if there is not some such reimbursement. She estimated that her role as President has occupied some 20-25 days/year directly attributable to the role, with further inroads into background time.

DG commented that RCR is looking at this but thinks that the outcome will be a decision not to reimburse employers in this way. The only college that she is aware of that does pay backfill is the Royal College of Physicians (RCP), for very senior roles.

RE felt that member organisations could not pay full cost backfill money to employers, noting that employers have an interest in supporting employees in such activities as part of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) obligations. He noted that a compensatory fee could be donated to employers, and that transparency is important. He is aware of some AHP organisations which fully compensate employers for time-out of staff undertaking professional activities of this nature, but that this does not improve committee attendance. He suggested that payment of some compensation to employers could engender improved partnership, noting benefits that can accrue to employers from supporting such activities.

GD was wary about opening discussions with employers. JKa suggested that we be clear that we are not able to reimburse the entire time but, noting that people sacrifice a substantial amount of their own time undertaking these roles during weekends and evenings, we could perhaps offer a small amount towards defraying the cost to trusts, recognizing the additional organisational challenge to the trust.

HW suggested writing to officials at a high level seeking their support. IW suggested that this issue be considered by the member organisations. GD proposed that he and HW write a short paper summarising the issues for the next ROC Board, and this was agreed.

**Action GD, HW**

## **12. Committee Structure**

GD referred to a paper which HW had written which had gone to the member organisation CEOs and members of the ROC-RCR working party. Whilst this is more a matter for ROC than ROC-E, there are some matters relevant to this meeting. One point is the role of industry representation on ROC-E; GD is very pleased that we have now turned a corner on this with PH's engagement. A second point is operational functioning, given urgency by RCR joining ROC and how we restructure joint congress organisation. It is noted that there are some sub-committees (e.g. marketing committee, exhibition committee) that are defunct.

We have engaged with an external legal adviser to try to bring our legal situation into line with current legislation and our structure. HW has asked a lawyer with a strong background in charity law to look at our current Memorandum and Articles of Association, with a view also to preparing the ground for simplifying/streamlining the ROC Manual. We are currently awaiting her proposals.

RE agreed that there are some governance issues, e.g. reference within these documents to time-limitation of director appointments. RE noted that the 4 CEOs will be meeting shortly to discuss these issues and make recommendations.

GD asked what committees, if any, should there be below ROC-E, and who should represent them on the board. SE commented that congress content management by the programme committees is great, but the PCO has nowhere to go for marketing, logistical, organisational and operational decisions. She suggested representation of all the member organisations at ROC-E, noting that IPEM are rarely invited to the ROC-E table – she thinks they and physics are missing. She felt that marketing strategy needs to involve all the members. She didn't feel that an exhibition committee is needed as we now have engagement, at various levels. HW commented that member organisations who only come to 2 meetings/year can on occasions feel out of the loop. GD summarised the feeling that ROC-E should have representation at ROC-E meetings from all the member organisations, at an operational not CEO level. JKo commented that representatives should have authority to make operational decisions without need to refer back to their member organisation.

GD asked PH his views on an AXREM (nominated) director on the ROC-E board. PH said he would wish to know more before committing himself/AXREM. He commented that AXREM had been crying out for more engagement so it sounds like an open door, and that he is receptive to learning more.

SW noted that AXREM only represents the major imaging companies and that there are 90 or so smaller companies exhibiting not represented by AXREM.

### **13. Any Other Business**

#### **13.1 Liverpool ACC venue contract 2018-2022**

SW noted there has been a change-over of personnel at the Liverpool ACC (Arena and Convention Centre) which has resulted in some delay in finalisation of the contracts for 2018-22 meetings. There is now some urgency for signing the contract. Whilst Liverpool have revised their subventions policy, they have agreed to arrangements which would have the same net effect as previously. They are content that we just commit to 2 halls at this stage, with an option for a 3<sup>rd</sup> hall. It was agreed that we accept and sign this contract.

**Actions SW, GD**

There being no other business the meeting ended and Profile Production staff left the room prior to the undertaking of reserved business.

The meeting closed at 1:20pm.



The next ROC-E Board Meeting will be held on Tuesday 26 September 2017  
at the Society & College of Radiographers  
207 Providence Square, Mill Street, Bermondsey, London, SE1 2EW  
starting at 2pm (scheduled meeting time 14:00–16:00)