

CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE 541st BOARD MEETING HELD
ON WEDNESDAY 20 MAY 2020, 11:30, BY SKYPE

Present:

Dame Deirdre Hutton	Chair
Richard Moriarty	from 12:40
Rob Bishton	
Katherine Corich	
Marykay Fuller	
AVM Ian Gale	
David King	
Anne Lambert	
Graham Ward	
Paul Smith	
Kate Staples	Secretary and General Counsel
Chris Tingle	

Apologies:

None

In Attendance:

Peter Drissell	
Tim Johnson	
Richard Stephenson	from 12:40
Ben Alcott	
Jane Cosgrove	
Sir Stephen Hillier	observer
Philip Clarke	
Barbara Perata-Smith	Minute-taker
Andrew Walker	for item 4
Robert Toal	for item 4
John Clyne	for item 4
Freya Whiteman	for item 4
Phil Dykins	for item 5
Roisin Edington	for item 5
Peter Fiddy	for item 5
Glenn Bradley	for item 7

Nic Stevenson	for item 7
Iain Libretto	for item 8
Julie Bryer	for item 9
Louise Stone	for item 9
Andrew Broadhead	for item 10

I. APOLOGIES AND INTRODUCTIONS

1. No apologies were received.
2. The Chair welcomed Sir Stephen Hillier, who was attending as an observer. Subject to the outcome of the pre-appointment hearing to be conducted by the Transport Select Committee (TSC), Sir Stephen would take up the role of CAA Chair on 1 August 2020, replacing Dame Deirdre Hutton.
3. The Chair also noted a number of changes to the running order of the agenda, as Richard Moriarty and Richard Stephenson were both at the Transport Select Committee (TSC) and would not be able to join until that had ended.

II. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, PREVIOUS MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

4. No new conflicts of interest were declared.
5. The minutes for the April 2020 meeting were approved and would be published in due course.
6. The matters arising from previous meetings were noted.

III. CHAIR'S UPDATE

7. The Chair commented that she had had no face-to-face meetings recently, due to the lockdown restrictions but had had many on line meetings. She had dialled into the CAA Gold Command meetings once a week to keep abreast of developments.
8. Other meetings included the CAA's Consumer Panel meeting to discuss its work programme for next year; a session with Huw Merriman MP, the Chair of the TSC, to discuss the remit of the CAA and the impact of the virus on industry; a plenary with the UKRN Chairs; and a conversation with Cranfield University. The latter was focused on research being carried out by the University to model and test how Covid-19 may travel in the airflows of an aircraft's cabin.
9. The Chair had also had a call with the Chair of Which? to discuss refunds and the stance of the CAA on enforcement. Paul Smith confirmed that he had arranged a follow-up call on this matter.
10. The Board noted the update.

IV. ECONOMIC REGULATION OF HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED: PROGRAMME UPDATE (DOC 2020-41) BY PAUL SMITH

11. The Board welcomed Andrew Walker, Robert Toal, John Clyne and Freya Whiteman to the meeting. Paul Smith confirmed that the airlines and the airport were still keen to continue the work to set the new price control, which would be applicable from 2022, but wanted to design a process that recognised the current uncertainty.
12. Mr Smith added that today the team would be seeking a steer from the Board on how to treat the early costs that Heathrow had incurred on planning of Runway 3 and confirmation that the direction of travel taken on the cost of capital and financeability were acceptable. Mr Toal commented that the next steps were to publish a consultation document in June following the earlier consultation in April 2020.
13. Early costs: Mr Toal explained that this area had generated debate in the past. Subject to consultation, the present intention was to follow the CAA's already established policy and allow Heathrow to recover the efficient costs it had incurred on Runway 3 through an adjust to the Regulated Asset Base. The Development Consent Order process for Runway 3 was currently on hold pending the outcome of the appeal process. The Board supported the approach but emphasised that the team needed to ensure the test on efficient spending was thorough and that the airlines had sufficient opportunities to discuss the issues through the process. Mr Smith confirmed the latter was the case.
14. Cost of Capital and Financeability: Mr Toal explained that these were complex issues. The team had carried out a significant quantity of work on the Weighted Average Cost of Capital before the crisis, and the analysis would need to be kept under review. The Chair enquired whether the Flint Report would be published. Mr Smith confirmed that was the team's intention, highlighting the fact that it should be treated as a piece of research that aided the CAA's thinking. The Chair added that the Board would support this as it was in favour of being transparent.
15. The Board approved the approach for both the early Runway 3 costs and the financeability and WACC issues and noted the report.
16. Mr Smith raised a matter regarding the Heathrow's Consumer Challenge Board (CCB). He explained that this had originally been set up to help hold Heathrow to account for how it reflected consumer's interests in its approach to business planning for Runway 3. Because of Covid-19 and the Court of Appeal's judgment, the Runway 3 project had been put on hold by HAL. Because of the delay and the

fact that the CCB was funded by industry, the CAA had decided to stand down the CCB.

17. This decision had generated some disagreement with both the CCB and the CAA's Consumer Panel. Mr Smith admitted that, although he felt that the team made the right decision to disband the CCB, the outcome could have been communicated in a better way with both the Consumer Panel and the CCB. Discussions had taken place with both groups.
18. The Chair confirmed that the Board was comfortable with the decision made and had written to both Panels to better articulate the rationale for the outcome, apologise for the poor communication and confirm that the CCB would be reinstated if applicable.
19. Mr Smith raised another matter relating to the recent decision to transfer the Consumer Panel and its secretariat from the CAA Strategy and Policy group to the Consumer and Market Group. The Panel disagreed with the outcome as it felt the move had compromised its independence. The Chair said she had disagreed with the Panel's view but had offered a direct line with Kate Staples as a form of reassurance, should any issues arise, although there had been no feedback on the proposal yet. The Chair asked Mr Smith to emphasise to the Panel that the Board valued its role and believed it should continue to express its views freely.
20. The Board noted the two issues raised.

V. AVIATION SECURITY ANNUAL REPORT (DOC 2020-43) BY PETER DRISSELL

21. The Board welcomed Phil Dykins, Peter Fiddy and Roisin Edington to the meeting. Peter Drissell highlighted two issues covered by the report: first, industry performance, and second a forward look to the future in the context of the current crisis and Brexit.
22. Industry performance: Mr Drissell said that the trend for the past year had indicated consistency in industry performance. Maintaining this performance and bringing it back up in the wake of Covid-19 would require diligence on the part of the sector.
23. Mr Drissell added that some five years ago the team had started to introduce a performance-based approach to regulation, which was bearing fruit. Gaps in technology that had been identified by audits had also been addressed.
24. Dave King praised Mr Drissell for his work and collaboration with the National Aviation Security Committee bringing CAA at the forefront of the work. The Chair added that since CAA had taken on responsibility for Aviation Security in 2014, performance had improved significantly thanks to a new approach to resource

- planning, introduction of performance-based oversight and reorganisation of the department.
25. Forward look: Mr Drissell explained that the AvSec team had grown, with the investment setting the department in good stead. The gender balance and part-time/full-time ratio were good, with continued focus on personal and professional development, for example by being encouraged to pursue Master's degrees.
 26. With regard to the regulatory framework, Security Management System (SeMS) was now becoming embedded in the sector. This was a positive development as a performance-based approach could only work if there was confidence in the quality assurance, which SeMS would provide. Mr Drissell added that all AvSec trainers were now required to hold a professional qualification and the approach to inspections had improved: an entity would not only be provided with a performance report highlighting areas for improvement, but it would also be supported in developing a remedial plan, with a six-monthly follow-up visit. As a result of this sharper process, most of industry now met the required standard.
 27. Mr Drissell asked the Board whether it was content for AvSec to continue pursuing this avenue with a view to make SeMS compulsory.
 28. The Board endorsed the request and the Chair praised Mr Drissell's excellent report.
 29. On Brexit, Mr Dykins said that the expectation was now for limited alignment with EU standards, bringing an opportunity to flexibly improve regulations and how they supported regulatory outcomes. SeMS would allow CAA to move to a more audit-based process, including remote assessments, which should be better for inspectors and industry alike.
 30. Mr King enquired how SeMS work could be taken forward as a professional qualification in the international landscape. Mr Drissell said that this could be done through ECAC, where the CAA played an active role. SeMS was an original UK concept and ICAO had requested formal training on this approach. CAAi now ran a training course on SeMS both online and in person. CAA would be keen to open up registration to beyond ICAO and make wider courses available through CAAi for the benefit of wider sector standards.
 31. Anne Lambert enquired whether there would be pressure to lower standards once the UK had departed from the EU. Mr Dykins said that the UK had been one of the parties driving for higher standards so there was a risk that without the UK, the EU would be pushed to lower the bar. The UK would continue to engage with ECAC and other bodies on international security standards.

32. The Chair asked whether the expensive machines to check temperature at airports would be likely to delay other security scanning equipment. Mr Drissell commented that the latter was mandatory but that an extension of time had been granted due to the current financial challenges experienced by industry. The machines to check temperature would not be regulated by CAA and were unlikely to delay investment in scanners as the latter would ultimately provide savings for industry.
33. Graham Ward commented on the industry support role that auditors were taking and urged the team to ensure appropriate boundaries for regulatory independence were kept in place. Mr Drissell explained that the aim was to encourage conversations on failings and look for remedial action, meaning that issues were fixed quickly. However, the team was aware of the risk of regulatory capture and had a system of checks and balances in place to mitigate this risk.
34. The Board noted the report.

VI. CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT (DOC 2020-37) BY RICHARD MORIARTY

35. The Chair requested an update on the Transport Select Committee that Richard Moriarty had attended. Mr Moriarty said that the focus of the session was on a strategy to get industry flying again, as well as dealing with job losses. On refunds, he had explained that the CAA tried to balance enforcement with awareness of airlines' current financial position and had indicated that there was a strong case for improving our enforcement powers.
36. The Chair congratulated Mr Moriarty for a good performance at the TSC and Richard Stephenson and the rest of the team for all the thorough briefings.

Update on live issues

37. Mr Moriarty gave an update on Brexit, confirming that the organisation was well prepared. A monthly delivery board was in place to oversee process. AVM Ian Gale enquired whether the CAA had appropriate resource and Mr Moriarty said that we needed around 21 FTEs for the State of Design team. Eleven experts had already been identified within the organisation, with recruitment for the rest following soon. Brexit was a ring-fenced area of work and the CAA would take all the steps to be ready for any new roles it would be required to take up in January 2021.
38. Mr Moriarty provided an update on NATS's financial situation.
39. Kate Staples gave a progress report on current litigation matters.
40. The Board noted the report.

VII. COVID-19 UPDATE

41. Richard Moriarty observed that all CAA teams had been busy supporting industry. The programme of work had moved into a steady battle rhythm, with weekly Gold

Command and daily Silver Command calls taking place. Internally, there had been a steady stream of enquiries from colleagues on the return to work, Brexit and the CAA's internal financial measures, which were due for review in June.

42. Jane Cosgrove provided a summary on the return to work plan. Aviation House would be ready and Covid-19 secure on 1 June, but only for those staff who were not able to continue working from home. In case of possible ATOL failures, the team had also reserved a space by the third-floor restaurant to be used by the crisis management team. Ms Cosgrove said that the team was currently working on a health and safety risk assessment to ensure readiness, including for field staff who would be provided with additional PPE if required.
43. During her recent 'Lifting the Lid' session, Ms Cosgrove had run a pulse survey to check colleagues' feeling about returning to work in an office. The outcome was that most people would be content to work from home for three months or more; were neither excited nor concerned by returning to the office (although a number of staff declared they were very anxious, mainly because of public transport, cleanliness and social distancing); and felt that remote working had not had a negative impact on their ability to deliver their objectives. Ms Cosgrove observed these were encouraging figures and would circulate the full survey to the Board for information.

ACTION: Ms Cosgrove

44. Ms Cosgrove said that Cabinet Office and the Transport Support Unit had taken up CAA's offer of support for the national effort dealing with Covid-19 and we had confirmed the resources available. Furthermore, we had continued positive relations with the CAA Trade Union side, including agreeing an approach for casual contracts and setting up a hardship fund.
45. Mr Moriarty commented that the current financial measures and salary reductions were on the agenda for an ExCo discussion on Friday 22 May and proposals would be tabled for the June Board.
46. The Board welcomed Glenn Bradley and Nic Stevenson to the meeting.
47. Mr Bradley explained that the Silver Command group he chaired was responsible for CAA's work supporting aviation's recovery and restart work and was feeding directly into the DfT's Expert Steering Group. The CAA's aspiration was that the UK Government would adopt the emerging international standards as at least part of the UK's public health framework.
48. Dave King observed that although global alignment was desirable, the development of the pandemic had not been globally consistent meaning that some states had different levels of infection. Mr Bradley replied that first, states should ideally declare own risk levels according to a graduated low-to-high criterion and second,

there was work taking place in ICAO to design global health corridors. On the latter, Ben Alcott explained that the objective of the work was to take a risk-based approach and that the public health corridors had been recently tested at Hong Kong successfully and would be expanded to Singapore, Paris, and Tel Aviv. Rob Bishton added that the health corridors concept was complex and would take time to be accepted by government.

49. Tim Johnson commented that, with regard to public health, the CAA had a role for crew's occupational health and working time directives, but passengers' health was an issue for government. In addition, as part of the broader package of restart policies to accompany the introduction of the 14-day mandatory self-isolation, government was requiring airlines to give health information to passengers at the point of booking, at check-in and on the flight. The Government was keen to legislate for this to happen rather than rely on voluntary compliance and had allocated an enforcement role for CAA. We had been clear with Government that we would be reactive and proportionate in this activity.
50. Katherine Corich enquired whether the UK was taking the digital approach in designing border schemes, as it had delivered benefits in New Zealand. Mr Johnson commented that digital solutions were part of the work but that our best way to influence would be via ICAO. The Chair suggested Ms Corich and Mr Johnson have a more detailed discussion off line.

ACTION: Ms Corich, Mr Johnson

51. Ms Corich enquired whether modelling had been done to test supply chain resilience to quarantine and whether we had access to modelling that offered an overview of the state of the global industry (for example, a map of financial resilience). Mr Moriarty said that he was not aware of any holistic model that looked at aviation as a whole.
52. Project Horizon: Mr Johnson said that the team leading this project had gathered ideas from a series of workshops to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the organisation whilst living within our means.
53. The Chair urged the team to be bold in their thinking. Mr Moriarty commented that Project Horizon was not just about being a good regulator, but also a better organisation and recruiter.
54. Mr Johnson added that the team would produce a paper outlining progress so far to get a steer from the Board in June, followed by a more detailed report in July.
55. The Board supported the approach and noted the update.

VIII. ANNUAL RISK REVIEW (DOC 2020-39) BY TIM JOHNSON

56. The Board welcomed Iain Libretto to the meeting. Tim Johnson explained that this was the annual risk review, ahead of the Annual Reporting & Accounts, providing a consolidated view of consumer, strategic and business risks, including the impact of the crisis on these.
57. Graham Ward commented that the role of the Audit Committee had reviewed all the top risks in the framework earlier in the year and had provided challenge and feedback to Iain Libretto and to the owners of the business areas. This year, the Committee had agreed to examine the top assessed risks and to test a selection of the lower rated ones. The conclusions were that overall the risk management framework included all relevant risks and mitigations and had been sufficiently well set out. There were some minor recommendations, for example the need to firm-up due dates to prevent the delivery of mitigations being postponed too many times.
58. Mr Libretto summarised Annex A, which included consumer and public risks before the crisis and Annex A1 which included those risks as impacted by the crisis. The key risks highlighting potential failures of ATOL holders and compliance to EC261 had all increased. A new risk was introduced to highlight possible airport failures.
59. Mr Libretto moved on to Annex B, which contained the strategic risks before the crisis and Annex B1, which showed the same risks as impacted by the crisis. Risk 4, relating to the UK not being part of EASA post-Brexit, had now crystallised and had become an issue. However, a comprehensive mitigation programme was being implemented. A new risk had also arisen, relating to CAA being given a new role to manage public health of passengers and its related enforcement. The team was already in conversation with DfT to set expectations about the nature of that enforcement role.
60. Dave King challenged the closure of Risk 4 on EASA, questioning that we should continue to monitor its impact. Mr Libretto explained that the risk, which had now crystallised, would be replaced by a new risk to track the evolution of our relationship with EASA post-Brexit. There were mechanisms in place to ensure we would be kept in the loop for matters of safety, such as the MAX 8, and we were expanding our engagement with other entities to help mitigate the lack of direct participation in EASA rule making.
61. Richard Moriarty enquired how CAA could have confidence that airlines safety performance, considering the redundancies that were taking place. Rob Bishton said that the aviation industry was familiar with having to deal with crises and the CAA had measures in place that allowed it to oversee the internal restructures and support their operations.

62. Mr Moriarty suggested that a new risk is created to highlight specific critical aspects of airlines' large restructuring programmes in the safety context.

ACTION: Mr Libretto

63. Mr Libretto moved onto Annex C which contained the business risks before the crisis and Annex C1 which showed the same risks as impacted by the crisis.

64. The Chair enquired about resourcing for the processing of airspace changes, in light of the fact that the crisis had in the short term slowed progress on airspace modernisation. Mr Libretto said this risk was captured in the risk framework under risk number 8.

65. Mr Libretto pointed to new risks 14, 15 and onwards in Annex C1 which highlighted potential ATOL failures and refunds, which were actively being managed. Paul Smith commented that the team was working on this and would be applying lessons learnt from the Thomas Cook failure. Additionally, improvements to the Air Travel Trust portal were being made to better manage and process claims, and we were considering ways in which failures could be managed remotely.

66. The Chair asked Mr Libretto whether he had evidence of the effectiveness of the framework. He explained that a key part of risk management was escalation, and this happened regularly, proof that the system was working well.

67. Mr Bishton enquired about the risk of cyber-attack. Mr Libretto said that this was listed in Annex C1. The Chair requested that this is closely monitored and thanked Mr Libretto for his diligence and determination in managing the CAA's risk framework.

68. The Board noted the report.

IX. FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS TO 31 MARCH 2020 (DOC 2020-40), BUDGET UPDATE (DOC 2020-46) AND BUSINESS PLAN ASSURANCE UPDATE (DOC 2020-45) BY CHRIS TINGLE

69. The Board welcomed Julie Bryer and Louise Stone to the meeting. Chris Tingle presented the report for the twelve months to 31 March 2020, an update on cashflow and the financial challenge, including the latest conversation with DfT, an update on the budget for 2020/21 and finally an update on the business plan.

70. Finance report: Mr Tingle said that the year-end had closed in a better position than expected, thanks to cost cutting measures and recruitment freeze. The current head count was 1185 which had increased slightly because of a number of new recruits that CAA had taken on.

71. Graham Ward commented that the results were still subject to audit and enquired whether there were any unresolved issues, for example the Thomas Cook

repatriation costs. Mr Tingle explained that the process was still in its early stages with no concerns so far. Ms Bryer added that the auditors had been provided with a comprehensive paper outlining the impact of separate matters, such as Thomas Cook.

72. Budget: Mr Tingle explained that ordinarily the paper would be submitted for decision, however, as the crisis was evolving, the team needed to get an understanding of how issues were also developing before being able to formalise a budget position. As such, the budget was still being updated and the plan was to present a budget to the Board in July.
73. Mr Tingle added that the overall increase in forecast headcount was due to new activities undertaken, so the Board would need to reflect whether it was sustainable to increase the forecast or whether it should be paused.
74. Graham Ward enquired to what extent volume reductions scenarios reflected actual plans of airline operators. Mr Tingle explained that the CAA's air traffic volume forecast came from Eurocontrol.
75. Mr Ward suggested the discussion to compare income and costs (as detailed in slide 3) could take place at the Audit Committee. Mr Tingle agreed and mentioned that a PIE in July had already been scheduled to brief the Board on how the current scheme of charges works.

ACTION: Mr Tingle

76. Business plan: Mr Tingle said that the paper offered an outline of the good results achieved last year and that the new business plan was still a work in progress, as the team was in the process of refreshing priorities with the individual business areas. Marykay Fuller asked whether it would be possible to better understand the impact of the activities that were being de-prioritised, in terms of budget and financial position. The Chair suggested a flexible plan in view of the evolving crisis.
77. Mr Tingle confirmed he would include both of those in the next iteration. This would be presented to the Board in June.

ACTION: Mr Tingle

78. The Board approved the report.

X. SARG MONTHLY SAFETY ISSUES REPORT (DOC 2020-31) BY ROB BISHTON

79. Rob Bishton briefly outlined the key points of the report. He mentioned that the focus had now shifted towards oversight, particularly for the EU exit phase and listed some of the successes achieved. These included the following: the team had supported the restart of flying for General Aviation (GA), which had enabled some GA pilots to deliver NHS supplies; helicopter activities, including off-shore, had been kept in

place; Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) registrations were still increasing and drones were able to support the nationwide effort by flying provisions to the Isle of Wight and in Scotland. Finally, Mr Bishton emphasised that the work had been a collaborative effort with all departments in CAA, which demonstrated how joined up the organisation was.

80. AVM Ian Gale commented that, in the military, the crisis had led to an acceleration of existing geo-political factors, such as the relationship between China and the US, while in government it had highlighted the issue of unmanned systems and their integration into daily life. Mr Bishton agreed and said that the UAS team had realised that the commercial utility of UAS would now grow more quickly. The same principle applied to the State of Design capability for emerging sectors. It was therefore important to exploit the opportunity to manage the interface between innovation and commercial activity.
81. Richard Moriarty added that ensuring flight beyond the line of sight was still a labour-intensive process, so the key would be to develop common electronic conspicuity standards to allow more operators in the air. Katherine Corich pointed out that, although the increase in drones was encouraging and would cement the UK position in this area, it was important to have an education programme in place. Richard Stephenson confirmed that the Comms team had been working with Mr Bishton's team to roll out an extensive and ongoing campaign.
82. Dave King enquired about the morale and fatigue levels of the teams. Mr Bishton commented that he had tried to manage both of those aspects by emphasising that the situation was likely to continue to the end of the year. Some colleagues had been moved into new areas of work, but workload at managerial level was still very high.
83. Jane Cosgrove added that people's welfare had been supported by Ben Alcott's work on mental health, including the introduction and operation of the mental health first aid network, by the Comms team's Operation Share and by monitoring the Employee Assistance Programme and seeking feedback from the Employee Forum on how colleagues were feeling. Information on mindfulness and on financial support was also available on the colleague intranet. However, more work was needed to better communicate the likely unfolding of the crisis, as per Mr Bishton's remarks. The Chair commented that a number of individual teams were having regular Zoom and Skype calls and that we should highlight the value of this social capital and encourage people to talk.
84. MAX 8: Mr Bishton said that the crisis had impacted progress. Although the FAA was keen to carry out the recertification and a test flight in the summer, industry's

priorities were now on gaining financial stability. However, many airlines had been retiring older and more inefficient aircraft so were keen for the MAX 8 to return to service.

85. Brexit was another priority and it would need close monitoring in the upcoming months. The Chair agreed and requested that David Malins, who heads up the State of Design work, could present an overview of this area of responsibility.

ACTION: Mr Bishton

86. The Board noted the report.

XI. INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT ON CAA'S INTERNAL WHISTLEBLOWING ARRANGEMENTS (DOC 2020-44) BY KATE STAPLES

87. The Board welcomed Andrew Broadhead to the meeting. Kate Staples explained that the External Whistleblowing Report will be presented to the Board separately. Today's matter related to the internal whistleblowing arrangements which had recently been reviewed following ExCo colleagues' concerns about the process. Mr Broadhead had carried out an internal audit to assess the situation and advised that the system was not robust enough and a new model was needed.

88. Mr Broadhead proposed that the new model should be overseen by a CAA Non-Executive Director (NED) to communicate to those making a report that matters referred were likely to be taken seriously. The NED would be consulted on the issue and have an overview of the scheme but not deal with the issue itself. The issues raised would be addressed by Ms Staples' team.

89. The Chair stated that she had asked Graham Ward to take on the NED role for the new internal whistleblowing scheme, as he was already the Chair of the Audit Committee and there was a clear connection between that role and the proposed one. Mr Ward had accepted.

90. The Chair asked the Board to endorse the approach and Mr Ward's new appointment. The Board approved both matters.

XII. FORWARD AGENDA AND ANY OTHER BUSINESS

9. Tim Johnson ran through the Forward Agenda and requested comments. He confirmed that at the June Board there would be an update on the budget, on electronic conspicuity and on Project Horizon.

10. The Chair asked about progress on electronic conspicuity, including alignment with DfT. Mr Johnson said that the vision for common standards was shared and discussion was on going about what those standards should be. A full update would be provided at the June Board meeting.

11. Marykay Fuller enquired whether the update on Project Horizon would include options on the funding model. The briefing on the latter was not until July and it would be premature to expect the Board to select a direction of travel for the future model before it had had the briefing. Mr Johnson confirmed that a decision would not be required at the June Board.
12. The Chair reiterated the need to keep acronyms to a minimum in papers.

Date and Time of Next Board Meeting:

17 June 2020, 11:00, by Skype