

**CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY**  
**MINUTES OF THE 547<sup>th</sup> BOARD MEETING HELD ON**  
**WEDNESDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2020, 10:00, on Microsoft Teams**

**Present:**

Sir Stephen Hillier  
Richard Moriarty  
Rob Bishton  
Katherine Corich  
Marykay Fuller  
AVM Ian Gale  
David King  
Anne Lambert  
Paul Smith  
Kate Staples  
Chris Tingle  
Graham Ward

Chair

Secretary and General Counsel

**Apologies:**

Ben Alcott

**In Attendance:**

Jane Cosgrove  
Peter Drissell  
Jonathan Nicholson  
Tim Johnson

as Interim Communications Director

Philip Clarke  
Barbara Perata-Smith

Minute-taker

Peter Gardiner for item 5  
Stewart Carter for item 6  
Andrew Walker for item 6  
Norma Hastings for item 7  
Julie Bryer for item 8 and 9  
Rachael Waller for item 9  
Jim Frampton for item 10  
Sophie O'Sullivan for item 10

Rachael Caston	for item 11
Stu Wain	for item 11
Martine Freeman	for item 12
David Oastler	for item 12

#### **I. APOLOGIES AND INTRODUCTIONS**

1. Apologies were received from Ben Alcott.

#### **II. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, PREVIOUS MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING**

2. No new conflicts of interest were declared.
3. The minutes for the 21 October 2020 meeting were approved with some minor changes and would be published online in due course.
4. The matters arising from previous meetings were noted.

#### **III. CHAIR'S REPORT (DOC 2020-85) BY SIR STEPHEN HILLIER**

5. The Chair commented that although the pandemic and associated recovery plans created a fast-moving picture, the overall context was that industry was still facing significant challenges, compounded by the second lockdown which had affected traffic volumes even further.
6. That said, there were a number of key components, essential to the recovery, that were starting to come together, such as a potential vaccine, passenger testing, quarantine arrangements decreasing, although uncertainty still reigned.
7. The Chair said that the CAA would continue to offer advice and support to guide industry towards recovery. However, while the crisis had been painful, the road to recovery presented risks as the sector would want to increase their activities as quickly as possible when their workforce had been reduced significantly. The challenge for CAA would be to help the sector identify risks before they materialised and address them, mindful of the potential for difficult conversations with entities if their proposed activities got near an acceptable risk tolerance.
8. The Board noted the update.

#### **IV. CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT (DOC 2020-86) BY RICHARD MORIARTY**

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

#### **Approval**

10. Draft resolution on modernising CAA Board meetings: Mr Moriarty thanked the Board for the comments received for the draft proposal and requested that the resolution was endorsed.

11. The Board approved the resolution

### **Live issues**

12. Passenger Locator Forms: Mr Moriarty summarised recent developments, including the government's intention to legislate for stronger standards and more robust enforcement arrangements undertaken by the CAA in the aviation sector. Mr Moriarty added that the PLFs could work as a solution when passenger numbers were low, but higher completion rates might be harder as traffic volumes increase significantly. The ideal outcome would be for an integrated checking system similar to the passport arrangement that automatically linked a booking with a completed PLF. The Chair requested an update on this topic as part of the risk summary to be provided at the December Board.

**ACTION:** Richard Moriarty, Rob Bishton, Paul Smith, Iain Libretto

13. Passenger refunds: Mr Moriarty commented that a number of airlines were continuing to fly during the second lockdown in England, which could limit a passenger's ability to obtain a refund, as the EC261 regulations only applied in case of cancellation or denied boarding. Airlines could of course choose to offer a rebooking or refund even if the passenger did not have a right to refund under 261. However, the CMA had identified another legislative vehicle focused on the frustration of contracts delivery which could be relevant to this situation.

14. We continue to work with CMA on airlines refunds.

### **Internal matters**

15. Inappropriate stakeholder behaviour: Mr Moriarty said that colleagues had provided positive feedback on the values and the policy on inappropriate behaviour within the organisation. However, several members of staff had also added that inappropriate behaviour from external stakeholders should also be addressed. Talking to other CEOs confirmed that these instances were common and a discussion at ExCo had indicated that strong action was required to give colleagues the tools and confidence to address these situations. Mr Moriarty added that Rob Bishton had volunteered to take this piece of work forward, to demonstrate our values were not just internally focussed but applied to the external interactions we had with industry. Commitment from the Board would also show support towards colleagues on the receiving end of inappropriate behaviour.

16. Jane Cosgrove commented that the CAA's policy on inappropriate stakeholder behaviour had recently been published externally, and we would raise awareness

internally to confirm our intentions to colleagues that the CAA took the matter seriously and would handle incidents accordingly.

17. Board members were supportive of ExCo's approach and said we should ensure our processes were smooth, to minimise frustrating bureaucracy that could irk stakeholders; should identify those who have offended and deal with them in the right way; and should be mindful of cultural differences, for example in the conversation tone.
18. The Chair summarised the discussion and added that the policy in place would be used to its full extent and that the Board strongly supported the cause.
19. Cognitive Impairment: Mr Moriarty mentioned that CAA was due to publish the report on Cognitive Impairment which had been carried out by Dr Sally Evans and that if any Board member was interested to request a copy directly from him.
20. The Board noted the report.

#### **V. SARG MONTHLY SAFETY ISSUES REPORT (DOC 2020-87) BY ROB BISHTON**

21. The Board welcomed Peter Gardiner to the meeting.
22. Rob Bishton brought the Board's attention to the part of the report detailing incidents and major safety events and welcomed questions. He added that in carrying out oversight work the team had been directed to constantly question our model of operations to ensure it adapted to the requirements of the environment. For example, CAA was continuing to challenge entities that intended to ramp up their operations about how they planned to maintain safety performance and the consumer experience. Weekly meetings addressed issues and concerns, developments in government policy and our response.
23. Internally, in addition to her Head of UAS role, Sophie O'Sullivan had also been appointed Acting Head of the GAU to cover Rachael Gardner-Poole's secondment with the UK Space Agency. A Rapid Capability Office would also be set up with colleagues working on problems that had shorter term challenges and deliverables. Mr Bishton thanked AVM Ian Gale for putting him in touch with an MoD colleague who had advised him on the military approach to such situations.
24. David King commented that risk 10, highlighting the impact of the recovery on operations, should be a key area of focus. The greatest potential risk of the pandemic for aviation safety performance could occur if there was an acceleration in passenger volumes – for example when an effective vaccine was introduced. Mr Bishton agreed and said that the team was working through this issue with individual entities and as a collective through the Industry Resilience Group (IRG) and would be designing appropriate mitigations.

25. Graham Ward enquired what activity was associated with risk 3, on change management. Mr Bishton explained that, when the team first dealt with the crisis, there were a number of safety notices themed around the decisions entities had to make to save costs. The notices were initially useful to keep CAA in the loop, but had now evolved into an instrument that helped us understand stakeholders' ability to manage their Safety Management System (SMS) through the recovery. The SARG team also worked with Paul Smith's team to discuss the financial resilience of organisations.
26. Mr Smith commented that conversations with airports had indicated many were reluctant to increase resource until some stability could be assured, and that, as a consequence, they accepted there may be a decrease in customer services. The team understood that security and safety would not be affected, but would monitor the impact on those with reduced mobility.
27. Richard Moriarty added that, in order to support the conversations Mr Bishton and his team were having with the SMS Accountable Managers, the messages around safety and security would be reiterated during bilaterals that he and the Chair had planned.
28. The Chair referred back to the list of headline risks and enquired whether rating the Max 8 at 20 was incongruous considering it was just about to be approved for return to service by the US FAA. Mr Bishton said that this issue had been debated at length, but the team had decided it would be prudent to keep it on our radar until such time the return to service had been successful.
29. Mr Bishton added that the team had been working extensively with airlines on supply chain management, and thanked Katherine Corich for attending the Safety Directors meeting. Mr Bishton extended the invitation to the meeting to any Non-Executive Director interested.
30. The Board noted the report.

**VI. UPDATE ON HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED'S (HAL) PRICE CONTROL OPENER (DOC 2020-94) BY PAUL SMITH**

31. The Board welcomed Andrew Walker and Stewart Carter to the meeting.
32. The Chair explained that, at the November PIE, stakeholders had asked about the quality of the CAA's process for considering this request. This follow up discussion was to allow the Board to review again the approach we were taking and the quality of our process. The topic would return to the Board for consideration in December and January.

33. Paul Smith set out the context for the paper and confirmed the team had sought expert advice to support its own analysis, including engaging with Anne Lambert and Marykay Fuller. The consultation had now closed, and the team would consider the responses in detail. The initial view indicated that a detailed cost of capital calculation would be best undertaken as part of the H7 price review which would allow the regulatory framework and risk and reward elements within to be taken into account as a whole. The team would also reflect on what other related analysis would be appropriate to carry out ahead of H7, including considering the framework for cost of capital analysis, and focus the approach on protecting consumers from any short-term issues with HAL's service quality and investment.
34. Mr Carter provided an overview of the consultation responses. The team had received about 30 submissions, which was more than most regulatory consultations, indicating that stakeholders felt strongly about the matter. Among those who responded were HAL, the airlines, the trade unions and the CAA's Consumer Panel, who were interested in understanding the implications of the decision specifically to consumers.
35. Anne Lambert commented that the research and analysis should be broad enough to provide evidence to support our decision. Specifically, it would need to explain whether or not HAL's proposal of an adjustment to the Regulatory Asset Base (RAB) would benefit consumers and if so why.
36. David King asked what sort of extraordinary circumstances would justify reopening the price control. Mr Smith explained that the reference to a reopener had been included in the licence several years ago. We recognised that the current situation was exceptional circumstances, and therefore the consideration now was on how best to respond in those circumstances, having regard to our statutory duties. The reference to the re-opener at Q6 did not define a particular response to exceptional circumstances.
37. The Chair summarised the discussion and concluded that the Board was content with the approach and process to date and looked forward to further Board review of the proposed decision.
38. The Board noted the report.

## **VII. CAA PEOPLE STRATEGY: REVIEW OF EMERGING THINKING (DOC 2020-88) BY JANE COSGROVE**

39. The Board welcomed Norma Hastings to the meeting.
40. The Chair set the context for the discussion and said the purpose of today's conversation was not to agree detail or implementation plans, but the broad

direction of travel of the work, recognising the endorsement required at the December Board.

41. Jane Cosgrove added that the review of the CAA's existing people strategy had been carried out with the help of Mightywaters, a consultancy firm that had experience in this field and that had facilitated a rapid piece of work, engaging with colleagues from around the organisation. The contractors had confirmed the current programme of work was sound, but had suggested the addition of pillars, which would make the strategy more focused. The aim would be for the strategy to be owned by the Board, be delivered by ExCo and supported by the HR department. Feedback was sought on the key questions included in the paper.
42. The Board members commented positively on the work, saying it was clearly representative of the discussions they had had with the HR colleagues and consultants. They added that in pillar 2, 'successful' should be removed from the sentence, as we wanted to encourage people to be accountable, no matter what the outcome was; that the values should be included when it was published; and that a one-page summary should be available as it currently too wordy.
43. The Chair also supported the direction of travel of the work and requested the comments were considered with the next iteration, including simplicity, a clear link to the values, a sense of resources required to deliver it and measures of effectiveness. The Chair asked for comments from the Executive Directors.
44. Tim Johnson said that we should focus on priorities and bandwidth to deliver the pillars - in view of our already pressing priorities - and commit to a small number of new activities where we could be confident they could be delivered, as well as factored into the budget agreement for next year. Kate Staples added that it would be helpful to understand the Board or RemCo's role in the delivery. David King said that RemCo was being refreshed and that new ToRs would be available soon, but that it was being positioned as a mechanism to monitor the effectiveness of the People Strategy delivery. AVM Gale commented that it should not be a lofty strategy that had no impact on the shop floor, but a living programme, so communications needed to reflect this requirement.
45. The Chair summarised the discussion and asked Ms Cosgrove to come back to the December Board with a second iteration which should include a clear delivery plan and metrics for the next 12 months; more detail on how the pillars could be achieved in the next three years; and a high-level focus and prioritisation rather than granular detail, as ExCo would have to be the one to agree the detail in the upcoming months.

**ACTION:** Jane Cosgrove

46. The Board noted the report.

#### **VIII. FINANCE REPORT FOR THE SIX MONTHS TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2020 (DOC 2020-89) BY CHRIS TINGLE**

47. The Board welcomed Julie Bryer to the meeting.

48. Ms Bryer said that the figures showed a positive variance, with the revenue continuing to hold up better than originally forecast. Savings had been achieved in estates, printing, stationery and project delivery, with costs having been managed well. The cash position was ahead of budget thanks to good work in debt collection and, finally, recruitment costs had been kept in check by the recruitment freeze, which had now been lifted for critical activities.

49. The overall position was positive, but we would need to continue to act diligently in managing our financial position.

50. The outcome of the Spending Review 2020 (SR20) was not due to be announced until 25<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The latest news from DfT indicated that HM Treasury (HMT) was supportive of base funding requirements, including liquidity support for our core regulatory activities and other key activities such as space and Brexit, but less so for the additional funding we had requested for ambition projects, including security maturity, cyber and aviation licensing, innovation, environment, skills development. The Chair commented that HMT's feedback created an interesting dynamic as we were keen to work on all the projects and would have to take an agile approach to calibrate ambition and timescales for these.

51. David King said that the positive variance was significant compared to the size of the grant and asked whether we would be able to keep the funds and whether it could affect our future bid. Mr Tingle explained that first, we were unable to carry forward the unspent balance and that final level of grant would be calibrated with our in-year liquidity requirement. Second, DfT had agreed our original forecasting assumptions, some of which had been provided by them, and therefore there was some joint ownership of a number of key assumptions.

52. The Chair commented that with the SR20 having become a one-year settlement (rather than the usual three) it would be more difficult for the organisation to commit to longer projects and that the Board needed to have an understanding of the balance of risk this would bring. Mr Tingle replied that large, multi-year projects could be deconstructed into smaller components, which could then be prioritised accordingly over a period of time. Funding for security maturity and cyber could follow this principle, however, projects such as the licensing system could not, as IT projects did not lend themselves to being half built so it would require assurance



that the funding requirements would be met. Katherine Corich suggested that certain activities should be ring-fenced to highlight not only the cost requirements, but also the benefits they would bring internally and externally, by being linked, for example, to relevant government's plans. Mr Tingle agreed and commented that if the SR20 bid was not successful, we would explore if funds could be secured through section 16 funding from the DfT.

53. Mary Kay Fuller enquired whether we should investigate the feasibility of developing automation in our services with third-party partners, such as CAAi, and explore alternative sources of funding beyond government or industry. This would mean setting up a different business model from our current one so would need to reflect the balance of risk. Mr Moriarty and the Chair agreed and added that Ben Alcott was already on the case.
54. The Chair requested that an update on the outcome of the SR20 is provided at the December Board meeting, with a clear outline of what could or couldn't be funded, with related risks. Additionally, the item should include material to stimulate a discussion on financial and external risks and suggest a few alternative funding sources for consideration.

**ACTION:** Chris Tingle

55. Ms Corich suggested a PIE session to brainstorm alternative and innovative funding and business models.

**ACTION:** Secretariat

56. The Board noted the report.

## **IX. SCHEME OF CHARGES CONSULTATION AND APPROACH FOR A FUNDAMENTAL REVIEW OF OUR CHARGES (DOC 2020-90) BY CHRIS TINGLE**

57. The Board welcome Rachael Waller to the meeting.
58. Chris Tingle set out the context for the paper and commented that, compared to previous years, the consultation proposed very modest changes, with no inflationary or general increases and no additions, apart from Brexit (for transitioning EU approvals and licences to the UK), space (for satellite licences) and market power determinations. This meant our charges had not changed from 2019/20 levels.
59. Ms Waller explained that the recommendation was for the Board to endorse the consultation document and agree that we could continue deferring an increase to the charges that we had originally proposed for 2020/21 before the Covid crisis. The next steps would be to present at the Financial Auditory Committee (FAC) and publish shortly after the outcome of the SR20 had been announced, on 25

November. Depending on the CSR outcome, the team was ready to tweak the consultation document but would wait and see to provide certainty.

60. Graham Ward supported the approach to charges and requested that the language was reviewed to ensure it reflected our role supporting industry in the recovery (for example, by changing 'enabling industry recovery' to 'facilitating').
61. The Board endorsed the proposal, subject to the comments being addressed.

#### **X. PILOT MEDICAL DECLARATION (PMD) FORM (DOC 2020-91) BY ROB BISHTON**

62. The Board welcomed Jim Frampton and Sophie O'Sullivan to the meeting.
63. The Chair explained to the Board that today's discussion would focus on how we could develop an evidence-base to provide assurance on the declaration decisions. These needed to be balanced between a purely medical perspective, requiring detailed checks and balances, and being completely self-managing by the individual, with no data cross-checks at all on our part. Rob Bishton added that we had the means to design a proportionate response, but that it would have to be implemented in a timely manner.
64. Jim Frampton summarised the key points of the paper and said that the FAA had recently carried out a review of PMD, identifying similar questions about availability of information. We did not currently have the ability to cross-check data between declarations and once the first declaration was made, an update was not required until the flyer reached 70 years of age, and then every three years thereafter. However, increased morbidity and cognitive issues started to become evident in the general population from around 50-60 years of age, which questioned whether the current requirements for the process were adequate. The safety data did not suggest the current process was unsafe but there was a lack of targeted data to support fully this claim.
65. Mr Frampton set out three options for consideration: first, a no-change approach; second, a light-touch approach, where CAA would gather the data and develop a system to enable cross-reference, without fully addressing the medical questions and without mandating the PMD; and third, we would work with DfT to update the Air Navigation Order (ANO) and mandate for an enhanced set of data to be entered and possibly change the update point to 50 years of age, to at least require an affirmative statement that nothing had changed from previous declarations.
66. The Board raised various comments on the specifics of the proposal.
67. Graham Ward enquired about the risk to the (up to) three passengers allowed in the aircraft with the pilot and whether the risk threshold had changed. Mr Frampton explained that the passengers would be exercising informed consent confirming

their understanding that their exposure to risk would be higher than in a commercial aircraft. Mr Bishton added that it was a challenge to ensure passengers were aware of the level of risks they were accepting.

68. Katherine Corich said that the lack of data was an issue and that we should look at the whole licensing system in a way that would allow identification of cross points of interaction between platforms.
69. Anne Lambert suggested focusing on risk ownership, to understand our role in the debate. Mr Frampton explained that when the requirement was first exempted for EASA licence holders, the CAA committed to exploring how to gather better data, something that was still to happen in a comprehensive manner.
70. Mr Moriarty agreed and commented that the discussion should focus on the issue of understanding our role in the context of government's policy position. We should therefore start our data gathering exercise but seek to put in place interventions to align with government policy and accept the risk.
71. Mr Bishton added that this was an opportunity to continue to be involved in the debate once formally detached from EASA and keep momentum until such time the medical evidence could be used to inform changes. Mr Frampton said that CAA would advise and continue to support DfT. Although there was no legal requirement for us to provide advice, we did so in our capacity of technical expert. It was important to ensure the process was correct to start with as we were the operating entity that would have to follow it. Ms Corich strongly encouraged CAA to build stronger longer-term evidence to support future consideration of this policy.

**ACTION:** Rob Bishton, Jim Frampton

72. The Chair enquired whether there was a plan in place to meet the 18-month deadline set out. Mr Frampton replied that the requirement was to set up a system to start data gathering and have enough lead time to work with DfT to consider any amendments to the ANO article. Sophie O'Sullivan added that the timeframe would be sufficient to allow us to decide how to gather the data required: because initial reactions on that had been negative, we would first see what data we could get on a voluntary basis and review the extent to which it could provide quantifiable risk reduction. Kate Staples suggested the team should involve entities closer to the GA community to improve engagement on this matter.
73. In closing, the Chair reminded the Board that the proposed way forward did not result in any increased risk. We were maintaining the status quo with regard to PMD, whilst gathering data which would inform us on whether there was potential

to reduce risk in the future. The Chair requested an update in six months' time or as soon as practicable.

**ACTION:** Rob Bishton, Jim Frampton

74. The Board noted the report.

**XI. UK AIRPROX BOARD (UKAB) PRESENTATION (DOC 2020-92) BY RACHAEL CASTON**

75. The Board welcomed Rachael Caston and Stu Wain to the meeting.

76. Chris Tingle commented that Rachael Caston had joined the UKAB in June as the new Chief Executive. Ms Caston's presentation would draw from insights prior to her arrival and set out what she had planned for the future.

77. Ms Caston focused on the increase observed specifically in the past year and concerning the sports and recreational section of GA, whereby for the first time the number of incidents was higher than those involving military flights and was on the increase. The trend was measured in events per million flying hours, which had proven to be the best metric, and which showed that, despite the number of flying hours decreasing, incident numbers were increasing. The reasons for this trend were varied and complex, although the fact that Safety Management Systems in commercial and military aviation were significantly more advanced when compared to GA could explain decreasing numbers for commercial and military aviation, but increasing for GA.

78. Ms Caston added that although statistical analysis was difficult, since 2019, the methodology had improved by combining 'safety barriers' with 'contributing factors' to the analysis. Aside from the lack of full electronic conspicuity, which was seen as a technical barrier, improvements would require a cultural shift, which was why efforts from the UKAB were focused on stakeholder engagement. The communications campaign was set on six principles, including an interactive and user-friendly website and app and presentations at events such as those hosted by the General Aviation Safety Council (GASCo) where Ms Caston had spoken about safety and human factors.

79. Plans for the future included enhancing data collection and analysis to improve understanding of the contributing factors and the differences between barriers, as well as continuing to engage with the GA community.

80. The Chair enquired whether the increasing trend could be higher still due to incidents not being reported, as it was not mandatory to do so, and asked whether the UKAB was a welcome contributor to conversations with the GA community. Ms Caston confirmed she thought the incident picture was accurate: although the

number of incidents had gone up, this included non-risk bearing ones. The increase indicated more reporting, and the proportion of risk-bearing staying the same suggested honest reporting. It could still be better, and Ms Caston mentioned that, when she presented at GA events, she tried to drive the message home that the best outcome would be to report through the radio as soon as an incident was witnessed. On the second question, Ms Caston said that she thought interactions were honest and that UKAB was generally perceived as an independent body with the sole aim of improving air safety, without apportioning blame.

81. Richard Moriarty noted that the report suggested that reporting was better but activity was riskier. He asked whether, with the end of the EU transition period approaching, this should affect the CAA's ambition to consider further options to deregulate. Ms Caston explained that there was a feeling in the community that if regulations were changed these would be focused towards retaining airspace access rather than to reduce protection of the individual. However, pilot understanding of risk was not always high and therefore some changes could be considered to encourage individuals to better understand and manage risk.
82. Rob Bishton added that private pilot flying was based largely on the 'see and avoid' principle. However, some pilots did not understand what technical equipment to purchase or its benefits and limitations. As such, improved education, such as that being provided through the EC rebate scheme, would bring a significant benefit in improving airmanship. The same applied to airspace infringements, as both were explored through the human-factors lens.
83. David King enquired whether there could be under-reporting. Ms Caston explained that airprox reporting was largely based on the perception of the individual, rather than being set to defined parameters. Flyers reported because they had felt threatened or wanted to prevent the incident from reoccurring. Double reporting rarely happened, and it was often related to differences in situational awareness between flyers (for example gliders and powered aircraft, as the former were used to being in closer proximity with other gliders, unlike the latter). Overall reporting seemed to be accurate.
84. The Chair said that he would be interested in having a separate conversation on how to apply the same principles of influencing behaviour and improving safety to the remotely piloted aerial systems. He then asked Ms Caston whether she was receiving enough support from the CAA and Ms Caston replied that the organisation had been very supportive but that she valued the UKAB's autonomy as it allowed her to reach out to the GA community more effectively.

85. The Board noted the report.

**XII. BREXIT PREPAREDNESS – END OF TRANSITION DASHBOARD (DOC 2020-93)  
BY TIM JOHNSON**

86. The Board welcomed Martine Freeman and David Oastler to the meeting.

87. Tim Johnson focused on two aspects from the dashboard: first, the state of our preparations and whether the plans in place would deliver the desired outcomes; and second, the extent to which our actions would improve the risk profile of the preparations third parties. Mr Johnson added that although there were still some amber activities, such as the risks around licence transfer volumes, overall, the CAA's plans were well advanced and in a satisfactory position. Mr Johnson also noted that we had considered how access to data would be managed after the Transition Period. Graham Ward said that he was grateful for the update.

88. The UK Government and EU negotiations on the future trade continued and CAA continued to provide technical support to the DfT where required. The Chair asked whether the team had been liaising with DfT to stress-test the plans. Mr Johnson confirmed that was the case, with both organisations being involved in each other's tabletop exercises and sharing and aligning contingency planning arrangements for the period either side of the 31 December 2020.

89. The Chair asked the Board whether there were areas of concerns. Marykay Fuller enquired about crisis arrangements in place. Mr Johnson explained that the team expected a range of activities, including providing guidance to individuals throughout December and operational support in the early days of Jan 2021. Mr Moriarty added that a number of teams would be on stand-by to respond, as would be DfT colleagues.

90. Katherine Corich praised the comprehensive plans and enquired whether the team had considered the risk of air safety agreements creating a block between the UK and the EU as a collective as opposed to individual Member States. Mr Johnson confirmed that would not be the case and Mr Bishton added that many activities were still governed by bilateral agreement, on a state-to-state basis rather than instigated through EASA. We would continue this approach, ensuring it was carried out in a way conducive to maintaining good relationships with EASA and other states.

91. Chris Tingle commented that good progress was being made on licence transfers, thanks to having deployed additional resource, including contractors. The original requests to stakeholders had been to apply for a licence transfer three months

ahead of January 2021. However, the team was still receiving high volumes of applications which would need to be managed sensitively in the oncoming weeks.

92. The Chair asked the Board to confirm they were assured by the plans discussed and the Board agreed that was the case.
93. The Chair also requested that a further update was provided at the December Board, sketching out the two-year future plan and identifying strategic opportunities. The revised dashboard should keep the same format but draw out lines of reporting and activities.

**ACTION:** Tim Johnson

94. The Board noted the report.

### **XIII. FORWARD AGENDA AND ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

95. The Chair extended his and the Board's congratulations to AVM Ian Gale for having received the Kindness Award.
96. Organisational matters – staffing changes: Rob Bishton said that following a review that had been started by the previous SARG Director, some staffing changes would take place in the areas of Safety Performance and Future Safety.
97. Organisational matters – resource pressures: Dave King requested an update on the areas of the organisation that were running hot and commented this progress report should be a part of every Board meeting. Richard Moriarty commented that a new wave of the Wellbeing Survey would shortly be issued and that the results would be brought to the Board for discussion in due course. The Chair added that the monthly CEO reports had an overview of wellbeing, and that the team would work on focusing on the pressure points, with the additional layer of data provided by the survey.
98. Brabazon Lecture: the Chair said that he would be giving a virtual talk at the Royal Aeronautical Society on Thursday 19 November if anybody wanted to attend, followed by a session with the Whitehall and Industry Group on 2 December. The speeches were available to share if interested.

#### **Date and Time of Next Meetings:**

**Wednesday 16 December 2020, 12:00 hours, on Microsoft Teams**