

CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE 545th BOARD MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 16 SEPTEMBER 2020, 12:00, on Microsoft Teams

Present:

Sir Stephen Hillier

Chair

Richard Moriarty

Rob Bishton

Katherine Corich

Marykay Fuller

David King

Anne Lambert

Paul Smith

Chris Tingle

Graham Ward

Kate Staples

Secretary and General Counsel

Apologies:

AVM Ian Gale

In Attendance:

Peter Drissell

Tim Johnson

Richard Stephenson

Ben Alcott

Jane Cosgrove

Philip Clarke

Barbara Perata-Smith

Minute-taker

Russell Veale

for item 6

Nic Stevenson

for item 7

Andrew Walker

for item 10

Stewart Carter

for item 10

Martine Freeman

for item 11

Glenn Bradley

for item 12

David Malins

for item 12

Jon Round

for item 12

I. APOLOGIES AND INTRODUCTIONS

1. Apologies were received from AVM Ian Gale.
2. The Chair noted that Ben Alcott and Jane Cosgrove would join the entire meeting.

II. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, PREVIOUS MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

3. No new conflicts of interest were declared.
4. The minutes for the 16 July 2020 meeting were approved with a number of minor changes. The minutes would be published in due course.
5. The matters arising from previous meetings were noted. The Chair commented that the Health and Safety Annual Report had been deferred to the October meeting and that all other outstanding actions had been updated. He added that he would review the list for duplications.

III. CHAIR'S UPDATE

6. The Chair provided an overview of his priorities for the organisation, which he had already highlighted at the internal online townhalls, and of the topics likely to keep the organisation occupied in the upcoming months. These included: the threats and opportunities of a post-Covid world, decarbonisation, our future financial model, preparations for further Covid related demands, regulating new technologies and designing our new operating model. Furthermore, the Chair noted that each Board meeting should include a people-related item, led by Jane Cosgrove, who would now attend every Board meeting.
7. The Chair concluded by saying that the letter from the Secretary of State, with his updated priorities for the CAA, should follow imminently and he thanked Richard Moriarty and Tim Johnson for their work on this. He added that the Board focus should be on providing leadership to allow people to do their day job well and monitor the balance between ambition and resource.
8. The Board noted the update.

IV. CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT (DOC 2020-63) BY RICHARD MORIARTY

9. Richard Moriarty requested two approvals from the Board and provided an update on a number of live issues.

Approvals

10. Scheme of charges: Mr Moriarty asked the Board to approve the recommendation made by ExCo not to increase our fees and charges for Q3 2020/21. The Board endorsed the request.

11. CAAPS Trustees: Mr Moriarty asked the Board to approve the appointment of Geoff Parker as a CAA Pension Scheme Trustee, with immediate effect and until September 2023, to replace Sean Parker who had stepped down. The Board endorsed the request.
12. **Live issues**
 13. Passenger Locator Form: Mr Moriarty said that the government was likely to legislate to ensure airlines were compelling passengers returning to the UK to complete the form before boarding the aircraft.
 14. CAA's future working model: internal pulse surveys and conversations indicated that our people wanted to work more flexibly in the future and we had planned to approach this work twofold: first, by reiterating that the current working arrangements would continue until Christmas 2020, although, as both offices were Covid-secure, we would encourage colleagues to meet in person periodically; and second, we would analyse the feedback and design an operating model where flexible working was embedded in the working practices. This approach would allow us to attract and retain a broader cohort of talent.
 15. The Chair opened the discussion for comments.
 16. Marykay Fuller enquired how we were discharging our current regulatory responsibility to enforce airline compliance with passenger information, particularly as passenger completion of these forms were currently only subject to spot checks by Borderforce. Mr Moriarty explained that the approach focussed on systemic airline failings rather than individual performance. Paul Smith added that the team would continue to follow this principle in the short term, but that longer term the model could see passenger non-compliance equalling denial of boarding by the airlines. This issue would however need monitoring to ensure those who were not technically- or computer-literate could not be unduly penalised.
 17. Mr Smith elaborated that the team had been monitoring whether airlines provided enough information to passengers on the requirement to complete the form, for example by doing mystery shopping at certain airports and purchasing tickets to verify the correct instructions were available. However, the team was mindful that passenger non-compliance might not be the airline's fault, but due, perhaps, to the passenger's lack of digital skills or decision not to complete the form despite being aware of the requirement to do so.
 18. Katherine Corich commented that, in view of the lack of a consistent global solution to support the Covid recovery, we should encourage ICAO to continue to make the case about the significant benefit that a collaborative and common approach would bring. Mr Moriarty confirmed that CAA was already working with ICAO to

- establish a bio-security baseline and for this to become embedded in airlines' supply chain, in the same way as the aviation security baseline. We continued to liaise with the FAA, as this was an issue that would continue to challenge all states.
19. David King enquired whether CAA's ambition for electronic conspicuity had diminished. Mr Moriarty explained that the appetite was still the same but that the organisation had decided to modify the approach so as to maximise the progress that could be made quickly. The Chair added that this was a live issue and that CAA was actively engaging with government.
 20. Graham Ward requested an update on the ATOL renewals work. On the latter, Mr Moriarty confirmed that we were in touch with most of our commercial stakeholders and we continued to participate in bespoke conversations to aid understanding of the impact of Covid on their businesses. Throughout the pandemic, CAA had managed to position itself as a trusted advisor to both government and industry. Mr Smith explained that the work was proceeding and that the team was seeing some companies exit the market with some being replaced by new entrants.
 21. The Board noted the report.

V. COVID STOCKTAKE (DOC 2020-64) BY RICHARD MORIARTY

22. Richard Moriarty set out the aims of the update, which were to provide a point in time assurance review, to confirm we were delivering what was expected of us, and to discuss the next steps for the work.
23. David King commented that there had been several instances when the organisation had been under pressure due to a crisis and its people had willingly stepped up to go above and beyond. We should therefore reflect whether we were managing our resources well enough to keep us away from the edge, in view of potential future pressure points, such as potential ATOL failures. Although this balance would be for the Executive Directors to manage, it was right the Board had a view.
24. Mr Moriarty agreed with Mr King's perspective and said that the work generated by the response to the Covid crisis was now being captured as Business As Usual (BAU) to ensure capacity could be properly assessed, rather than expect colleagues to carry out their BAU and the work associated with the Covid recovery. In order to support this, we were implementing the approach to prioritisation proposed by Project Horizon. We would also focus on recruiting a greater proportion of colleagues with agile and adaptable skill and mind sets, to allow for internal staff movements addressing pressure points where possible. This was work in progress led by Jane Cosgrove. Finally, we would also be reflecting on the

challenges that were being brought by concurrent high tempo demands on the organisation (e.g. Brexit, Covid) and the effect on our operating model.

25. Mr Moriarty updated the Board on the external Covid recovery activities. He commented that industry was asking government for a robust testing regime for aviation and a financial support package to see them through the winter. This was a matter for government to decide on. CAA continued to focus on providing effective day-to-day oversight of and assistance to industry and on supporting government with a range of issues such as passenger location forms, on Brexit and on the international stage, the innovation and technology agenda and taking forward the airline insolvency review.
26. Graham Ward offered to share lessons learnt from designing the International Standards of Accounting and Auditing to support the work on the internationally agreed standard for biosecurity. Ben Alcott commented that CAA had been included in the ICAO group that led the design of the recovery plans and our representative was also encouraging agreement to create international standards. Other ICAO groups focused on the passenger journey, General Aviation (GA) and state level implementation, with CAA fully committed to those as well. The latter was the biggest issue, also affecting the EASA Member States.
27. The Chair enquired whether embedding crisis work as BAU required a deep look at the organisation's structure to ensure it was properly configured. Mr Moriarty confirmed that we needed to review the CAA's structure and culture, which was being taken forward by Project Horizon, set priorities and staff capacity to allow focus and align the Board's risk appetite with the organisation's. The Chair suggested that a separate conversation should take place to explore this further and that he would like a reminder on the CAA's system for reward and recognition.

ACTION: Sir Stephen Hillier, Richard Moriarty

28. The Board noted the update.

VI. RESPECT AND DIGNITY AT WORK AND CAA'S RESPONSE TO THE PEARN KANDOLA REPORT (DOC 2020-65) BY JANE COSGROVE

29. The Board welcomed Russell Veale to the meeting.
30. Jane Cosgrove introduced the item. First, Ms Cosgrove said that the team had been working on developing a new set of values for the organisation: the most popular, according to the votes from the colleague working groups, had been 'Respect Everyone', which would be worth bearing in mind in light of this conversation. Second, the engagement plan had not been included in the Board pack, but would be discussed as part of this item and would comprise of a blog

from Richard Moriarty, a series of townhall meetings, and a People Managers Event on inclusive leadership and what it meant. The remaining actions had been listed in the pack and were designed to support colleagues in dealing with the examples of inappropriate behaviour highlighted by the report. Pearn Kandola were comfortable with our existing Diversity and Inclusion (D&I) plans.

31. Richard Stephenson observed that the CEO's blog should emphasise the positive actions the organisation was taking already, and the D&I-related programmes of work we carried out, such as publishing the Gender Pay Gap, to ensure a balanced message was conveyed. The Board noted that those who had contributed to the report had done so on a confidential basis. Mr Stephenson added that there was a risk the report would be requested under FOI provisions or by the media and might have to be disclosed in some way, or would be made public having been made available in some other way. Despite the risks the CAA was committed to always trying to do the right thing, however, and this would underpin the planned engagement, both internally and externally.
32. Richard Moriarty commented that the report's themes required a strong message with a clear and robust action plan to demonstrate the organisation would not accept inappropriate behaviour. Mr Moriarty said he would share his draft note for comments.

ACTION: Richard Moriarty

33. The Board discussed a number of further points, including the following: the requirement to provide support to those who had experienced inappropriate behaviour and a clear statement the organisation would not tolerate it; the need for a distinction between isolated episodes of mild inappropriate conduct and serious instances, which would be addressed in the formal way and dealt with definitively; reflections on whether episodes of inappropriate behaviour should be named for what they were rather than aggregated into a category, as experience and research had indicated the former was more effective in instigating change; and finally on the importance of education to generate understanding of the sometimes fine line between behaviours.
34. The Chair asked the Board members to reflect whether there were any omissions from the proposed action plan. Suggestions included ensuring there was a clear process for mediation to encourage conflict resolution and considering whether an impact statement could be an effective way of raising the perpetrator's awareness of the consequences of their behaviour. Mr Veale confirmed both options were being investigated.

35. All agreed that addressing the cultural element of inappropriate behaviours would be a challenge, particularly if it had not been challenged robustly enough in the past, but there would definitely be a path to improvement, across a spectrum, by educating and supporting people.
36. The Board endorsed the proposed action plan and noted the report.

VII. PROJECT HORIZON: PHASE TWO TERMS OF REFERENCE (DOC 2020-66) BY TIM JOHNSON

37. The Board welcomed Nic Stevenson to the meeting. The Chair noted that the paper proposed to update the Board on developments with Project Horizon since the last meeting and requested endorsement of the Terms of Reference for the next phase of the work. Tim Johnson added that the current focus was first, on ensuring agility in the project team's resource and delivery due to the potential for concurrent demands on the CAA over the winter, and second, on developing the themes for the target operating model and structure of the organisation, which were flexibility and prioritisation.
38. The Chair opened the discussion for comments.
39. On 'Our role for leading decarbonisation', it was noted that calling the work 'decarbonisation' implied that efforts would be focused on technology and fuels, while calling it 'environment work' would incorporate a broader range of elements, including the leadership one. The Chair agreed that we needed to set out more clearly what aspects of the environment the organisation could work on and how to describe them collectively. Katherine Corich added that decarbonisation was more correct as it was in line with the government's focus and public sentiment.

ACTION: Tim Johnson, Nic Stevenson

40. On 'Our role in innovating and exploiting new technology: getting ahead of industry', it was suggested that the language should reflect the fact we facilitated action rather than direct it. Mr Johnson explained this was designed to capture how we would help industry to consider all issues more holistically. David King added that it should also include the fact that the organisation should be up to date with the regulatory process to ensure no part of it could be outdated and thus a potential inhibitor of innovation. Ms Corich commented that it was important to anticipate industry as we would be trying to regulate an increasingly automated sector and needed to understand the challenges of that in innovation in order to properly carry out our role.
41. On 'More effective means to protect consumer interests, including planning potential future airline insolvencies', Marykay Fuller observed that the language

seemed to indicate there was a gap between our action and intention, in an area where it was difficult for us to influence. Mr Johnson replied that it reflected a desire to strengthen the insolvency regime and that we would be encouraging and supporting the government to make the necessary legislative change.

42. Subject to the points above, the Board endorsed the proposed ToRs.
43. Mr Johnson said that the next update would be at the ExCo PIE in October, to review and enforce the proposed strategic framework, CAA values and regulatory approach.
44. The Board noted the report.

VIII. GOVERNMENT SPENDING REVIEW 2020: CAA'S SUBMISSION INCLUDING BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS FOR 2020/21 (DOC 2020-67) BY CHRIS TINGLE AND TIM JOHNSON

45. Tim Johnson took the paper as read and updated the Board on discussions with the DfT about our Spending Review submission. He noted that the DfT was aligned with our aim to ensure our core capacity and capabilities was secured. This would be particularly important given the new responsibilities the CAA and UK were taking on at the end of the Transition Period, the level of support required by the sector during the current Covid crisis and the Government's priorities for the CAA in other areas such as innovation, airspace modernisation, General Aviation, STEM and the environment.
46. Chris Tingle summarised the submission that had been made and added it included first, funding to support our BAU activities, which DfT was aligned with as per above conversation, and second, funding to support Project Horizon and the Automation Blueprint proposal. The Chair commented that the assumptions on traffic volumes should be as up to date as possible as they were driving how closely we were tracking to the forecast budget in the current year. Furthermore, the submission included capital that would allow us to meet our stakeholders' expectations on service delivery, which we would not be able to satisfy unless we were appropriately funded. As such this should be considered during the negotiations.
47. Graham Ward observed that we should agree precisely our regulatory activities as these were more granular than what the duties specified and could lead to assumptions being made. As for the particulars of the paper, Mr Ward asked whether more cash headroom should be created in order to mitigate against future potential shortfalls. Mr Tingle replied that the agreed DfT funding would set us in good stead for the current, but we would need to continue monitoring the traffic

volumes as these had an impact on our variable income. DfT were aware of this risk when the financing support package was put in place.

48. Marykay Fuller noted that there was no transition period between the two phases outlined, the first being the short-term adjustment we had to make to not being self-funded, and the second the long-term evolution of our funding model. Mr Tingle replied that the team was taking incremental steps, the first of which was to secure the required financial support over the spending review period. Furthermore, because of industry's current challenges, proposing changes to the funding model would not be welcomed by stakeholders. If government decided to underwrite our charges long term, this would create opportunities – and risks – to introduce more radical changes to the funding model.
49. The Chair enquired about the tight timelines, as the Government Spending Review was current expected to conclude in December 2020 and the Board should have regular visibility of progress with the negotiations to understand the likely outcome. Mr Tingle explained that the process was new to the organisation and that, as well as the Review, we would need to undertake work to determine our top-down budget, to then socialise with stakeholders and consult on any changes to charges in November. Mr Tingle proposed a conversation on the scheme of charges at the November Board.
50. Richard Moriarty commented that although the Review's timeline was dictated by government, we were actively having discussions with government at all levels. The Chair added that the imminent letter from the Secretary of State on his priorities for the CAA would be a valuable input into the discussions.
51. The Board noted the report.

IX. SUMMARY FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE FOUR MONTHS TO 31 JULY 2020 (DOC 2020-68) BY CHRIS TINGLE

52. Chris Tingle explained that we were currently tracking ahead of the Covid budget, with a positive variance. The primary risk was still around traffic volumes and although flight numbers were reasonable, passenger load factors were generally very low, which had an impact on our income. Cash was positive as debt collection was proceeding as planned.
53. Mr Tingle added that he had been in conversation with DfT on how to recognise the 2020/21 s.12 grant funding in the P&L in line with accounting standards. Graham Ward supported Mr Tingle's preference and the need to continue engagement with DfT to ensure agreement.
54. The Board noted the report.

X. HEATHROW AIRPORT REQUEST TO REOPEN ITS PRICE CONTROL: CAA'S APPROACH AND NEXT STEPS (DOC 2020-70) BY PAUL SMITH

55. The Board welcomed Andrew Walker and Stewart Carter to the meeting.
56. Paul Smith summarised the issue and noted that the team had sought expert external advice on their thinking. The Board discussed that the impact of Covid had raised important issues for consideration in the next price control, and reflected asking Heathrow and other stakeholders for more evidence and views on the proportionate approach to any intervention before consideration of the issues in the H7 review. The thinking between the team and the external experts was aligned. Anne Lambert and Marykay Fuller had been closely engaged in the discussions throughout.
57. Ms Lambert added that, although the decision seemed sensible, considering the evidence and supporting advice, we should continue to monitor service quality provided by the airport, in case it worsened and started to affect customers, which might provide ground for intervention.
58. The Chair asked the Board to approve the consultation on the proposed response to the HAL submission. The Board endorsed the request.
59. The Chair asked the Board to approve delegation of responsibility for drafting and sign-off of the consultation to Paul Smith and Andrew Walker. The Board endorsed the request.
60. The Chair asked the Board to approve the team's proposed approach to stakeholder management and external communication. The Board endorsed the request with the following comments. First, we should ensure we clearly stated that we would carry out the next price control review in the fastest and most proportionate way possible, as we appreciated it would be an urgent issue for HAL and its stakeholders. Second, we should ensure that our external message clearly outlined the rationale of our decision for clarity and completeness.
61. Mr Smith added that the consultation would be published towards the end of September, with updates to the Board to follow if required.
62. The Board noted the report.

XI. EU EXIT: STOCKTAKE OF CAA'S PREPARATIONS (DOC 2020-71) BY TIM JOHNSON AND ROB BISHTON

63. The Board welcomed Martine Freeman to the meeting.
64. Tim Johnson summarised the paper and said that it focused primarily on the activities CAA had been tasked with, noting that the category of 'Industry

Engagement' was now more amber than green. Richard Stephenson explained that there was an inherent risk brought by the requirement for communicating a lot of information in little time which meant that clarity could be lost, but that the team was continuing to sharpen plans to address the risk. Furthermore, there was also a requirement to update publications, the main website and the micro site, all possibly over the Christmas period. The plans were complex for both workstreams, but the team had processes in place which we were following.

65. Mr Johnson set the context for the wider trade agreement negotiations and said that these were unlikely to reach a conclusion until the Autumn. CAA had provided technical assistance to DfT on a number of issues
66. The Chair asked the Board's views on preparedness. David King asked whether the table, which was mainly rated as green, actually reflected the reality of the current status overall rather than in relation to specific activities, such as State of Design where we had made strong progress with the recent recruitment. Mr Johnson explained that, because our planning assumption had consistently been for a non-negotiated outcome (a "no deal"), the preparations had been carried out accordingly and methodically, with two periods of readiness in 2019. State of Design had always had the highest risk profile but that was under control, thanks to the excellent work by SARG's airworthiness team. Whilst we had strong plans in place, we were not being complacent and therefore continued to test the plans and make adjustments as necessary.
67. In reply to further queries from Board members, Mr Johnson confirmed that the team would carry out desktop exercises to test the transition point readiness, but that overall most of the milestones detailed on the plan had been delivered. More work was required on the new approach policy development and implementation that would apply after the end of the Transition Period and some further planning on the industry engagement, as previously explained. The IT requirement had been agreed and the team was working with finance on determining any changes to fees and charges. Mr Johnson also reassured the Board that the crisis management team was in place, although there was a small amount of overlap between those who would contribute to Brexit and those who would be called to deal with any potential ATOL failures over a similar period.
68. Marykay Fuller enquired about the interdependencies between our plans and others'. Mr Johnson explained that although there were some interdependencies linked to the final nature of the agreement between the UK and the EU, the team was confident they had robust plans that could be effective in most circumstances. Our positioning was also helped by the new legislative framework for UK aviation,

which replicated the existing EU framework and had been in place for a while. The Chair commented that there was a risk that the negotiations would not consider in full some of our core requirements which could impact us, so it was paramount we were aligned with DfT's thinking and continued to be diligent in preparations and our testing of them.

69. Richard Moriarty mentioned that there would be a risk that a number of operators might be late applying for permits and that we would need to be ready to react at short notice. David King enquired whether a back-up plan was in place, should we lose critical staff to illness. Mr Johnson confirmed the crisis management team was being established but it had pinch points. Reflecting on how to build resilience was important as the pandemic might push activity towards the very end of the year, which would require contingency plans in place for us and for government. Mr Tingle added that staff reserves were available, however, their deployment might affect BAU so solid prioritisation was essential, especially if Brexit, the pandemic and ATOL failures happened concurrently.
70. The Board agreed the plan seemed thorough but emphasised that we should continue to be diligent in those preparations. The Chair added that time was short as by mid-December we would need all plans to be ready for delivery, including communication to industry. The Board was assured for now but would welcome regular updates and early notification of any major issues.
71. The Board noted the report.

XII. SARG MONTHLY SAFETY ISSUES REPORT (DOC 2020-72) BY ROB BISHTON

72. The Board welcomed David Malins, Glenn Bradley and Jon Round to the meeting.
73. Rob Bishton noted that the more detailed operational report had been shared through Board's Library folder and contained information on regulatory actions and key safety issues. The team would welcome the Board's steer on the evolving structure of the report. With regard to the reporting of safety risk information, the Chair advised Mr Bishton to engage with the Board to understand what parts of the detail they valued and how it should be best presented in the report.

ACTION: Rob Bishton

74. With regard to Brexit, the team had been managing industry relations according to a set of principles that included health and wellbeing, efficiencies and the longer-term strategic operations. The pandemic had had an effect and would continue to do so on the health of industry, so there would be broader factors for the team to take into account, such as potential government's support, but in the meantime

the team continued to have a positive impact on the human factors programme. The performance of the team had been good, but it was the proximity of the risk that was making the dialogue evolutionary.

75. In theory, with less commuting and less work with industry, stress levels should have dipped. However, some teams still felt the pressure of increasing workloads. We continued to evolve the work and focus of the Safety Leadership Group (SLG) and we planned to return to the Board with options on how to best socialise the discussions from the group with the Board members, to better provide a broader safety picture.
76. The Max 8 ferry flight for TUI had taken place and had attracted little media interest.
77. Mr Bishton commented that Rachel Gardner-Poole had accepted a secondment with the UK Space Agency from 5 October to lead a transformation programme for a period of 6-9 months. The risk from the loss of leadership was softened by the presence of good managers in the department, although the issue of government relations still needed addressing, this was a work in progress and might bring development opportunities for staff.
78. Graham Ward enquired about how the pandemic has changed the relationship between SARG and the industry accountable managers. Mr Bishton explained that the team had tackled the conversations in a proportionate way, but that the key was to look at outcomes and actions without being too fixated on procedures). There was still some inherent rigidity in these processes which the pandemic had started to change and which we needed to embrace in order to ensure we maintained a credible role for government and industry. The Chair asked Mr Bishton to report regularly to the Board on how this issue developed.
79. The Board noted the report.

XIII. AVIATION SECURITY QUARTERLY REPORT (DOC 2020-73) BY PETER DRISSELL

80. Peter Drissell introduced the paper and noted that the focus was on the challenges and priorities of the work, going forward.
81. Marykay Fuller enquired whether there were gaps in the processes that related to Brexit. Mr Drissell explained there were no gaps as the modelling had been based on a no-deal agreement and the team would continue to work on this basis.
82. Graham Ward commented that it had been a great idea to introduce Accountable Managers in the process.
83. The Board noted the report.

XIV. FORWARD AGENDA AND ANY OTHER BUSINESS

84. Tim Johnson ran through the Forward Agenda and noted that the key items on the agenda for the next Board meeting included an update on Project Horizon, electronic conspicuity, the Whistleblowing Annual Report and the GA reform post-Brexit.
85. The Chair requested that each meeting contained a people-related item and Jane Cosgrove confirmed that the work on the new organisational values was proceeding well and would be presented at the October Board.
86. Chris Tingle asked to add an item on the Scheme of Charges Consultation and the proposed budget in the November agenda.

ACTION: Secretariat

87. There was no other business to discuss.

Closing remarks

88. Richard Moriarty summarised two key points from the meeting. The first related to the organisation's ability to balance capacity with activity, which needed further work to understand the trade-offs more visibly. The second was with regard to maintaining flexibility in managing forward agendas to ensure topics that might require discussion could be accommodated and asked for the Board member's forbearance with this issue.
89. The Chair agreed with Mr Moriarty's remarks, particularly in view of the fact that such a combination of events had not been experienced before. As such he encouraged the organisation to reflect on how crisis mode could be transformed into BAU in an agile way.

Date and Time of Next Meetings:

Wednesday 21 October, 9:30, on Microsoft Teams