

CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE 551st BOARD MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 17 MARCH 2021, 11:00, 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:

None

In Attendance:

Ben Alcott
Jane Cosgrove
Peter Drissell
Tim Johnson
Jonathan Nicholson

as Interim Communications Director

Philip Clarke
Barbara Perata-Smith

Minute-taker

Nic Stevenson
Joel Grundy, Q5
Chris Parson, Q5
Glenn Bradley
David Malins
Rick Newson
Rob Olney
Sophie O'Sullivan

for item 6
for item 6
for item 6
for item 7
for item 7
for item 7
for item 7
for item 7 and 8

Jon Round	for item 7
Neil Winbolt	for item 8
Stewart Carter	for item 10
Jon Clyne	for item 10
Mantas Aleksa	for item 10
Matt Taylor	for item 11
Ed Kent-Bending	for item 11
Leo Capernaros	for item 12

I. APOLOGIES AND INTRODUCTIONS

1. No apologies were received.

II. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, PREVIOUS MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

2. No new conflicts of interest were declared.
3. Graham Ward would recuse himself from item 10.
4. The minutes of the 10 February 2021 meeting were approved with some minor amendments and would be published online in due course.
5. The matters arising from previous meetings were noted.
6. Regarding action 106, the Chair commented that we intended to pull together the various discrete activities that were taking place in relation to the environment and sustainability. This would ensure a comprehensive and objective understanding that would support the design of the new strategy towards the end of the year.

III. CHAIR'S REPORT (DOC 2021-11) BY SIR STEPHEN HILLIER

7. The Chair summarised a number of headline points for discussion.
 - Reopening of UK travel: government had provided some indicative dates in April and May for the re-opening of sectors affected by Covid, including travel within, from and to the UK. Those dates should guide our work in order to meet the industry and the public's expectations.
 - Covid-19 recovery: the CAA's approach to the recovery phase was part of the SARG report – which would be discussed later in the meeting – but also an element of the Horizon project and of the ISD proposals. The recovery was a theme present in all of our work and understanding what this meant in practice would help us to deliver it more effectively.
 - Funding: over the past 6-9 months the CAA's financial position had stabilised, thanks to the Government's grant, and thus it had not been a prominent

feature of Board discussions. However, a combination of potentially diminishing support from DfT, increasing ambition and external factors might bring about a decrease in income and pressures to increase expenditure. In such circumstances there would likely be sharper focus on our finances, particularly on the need to balance ambition and financial stability.

8. The Board noted the update.

IV. CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT (DOC 2021-22) BY RICHARD MORIARTY

Approvals

9. Philip Clarke recused himself from the discussion concerning the first approval.
10. CAAPS: The CEO asked the Board to approve the following: first, for Bob Jones to be re-appointed as a Member Nominated Director for the three-year period commencing on 1 April 2021 and ending on 31 March 2024; and second, noting that David Armstrong would be stepping down as a CAAPS Employer Nominated Trustee, that Philip Clarke, Business Manager to the Chair and Chief Executive, be nominated to fill that vacancy, subject to the CAAPS Trustee Board approval.
11. The Board endorsed the request.
12. Philip Clarke returned to the meeting.
13. CAA overdraft: the CEO asked the Board to approve the renewal of the agreement with NatWest for the reduced £5m unsecured overdraft facility. The overdraft had been reduced in light of the funding arrangements in place with DfT, but the facility had been kept in place to ensure a prudent approach that balanced the facility's costs with the flexibility it provided.
14. The Board endorsed the request.

Live issues

15. Recovery: the Board was assured that teams were engaged in the work of the Global Travel Task Force at both strategic and operational level, on, for example, travel certification. There was a disconnect between the expectations of industry and public and the UK government's ability to commit to meet them, in light of the pervading uncertainty. This required our teams to be able to provide the correct advice and information on the rights of consumers when booking flights and holidays, working with consumer organisations. The work on this and other Covid-related issues was currently being carried out by a cross-CAA team of 10-15 colleagues.
16. The Board agreed that this was an area of concern that should be flagged to government in advance of travel being reopened and as part of our advisory role.

17. Jet Zero Council: the CEO confirmed that he was now part of the group, which brought together Whitehall and industry with the ambition to develop an emission-free transatlantic flight within this generation. The Council had political support and it was important that CAA played its part in the innovation and regulation debates. Some innovators were keen to scale up quickly in areas where certification was not yet available, so it was paramount that we configured our position to maximise success without compromising the boundaries of our role and considering our approach to sustainability.
18. Updates to the Board would follow as required.
19. Non-scheduled carriers and UK/EU level playing field: the CEO briefed the Board on this issue and explained that there was a difference in the criteria used by CAA and by other European authorities in relation to issuing foreign permits, with the latter more strict than the former and therefore having greater impacts on UK airlines. We had indicated to government this was a matter for discussion as it would require a clear and transparent policy framework to rationalise any amendments to the criteria in favour of UK airlines.
20. Project Palamon: CAA published its final decision in February, as previously notified to the Board.
21. Ryanair litigation: a brief update was provided, confirming that the litigation had now been settled.

Internal issues

22. The colleague engagement survey had had a good response and was completed by 78% of staff. Town Hall sessions were also well attended, indicating positive engagement across the organisation. The new wellbeing strategy would help to address some of the more difficult issues, such as individual struggles, and would ensure momentum was maintained. The communication on pay and annual leave seemed to have landed well.
23. Approximately 125 colleagues had joined the CAA since the first lockdown in March 2020 and some had never even seen the offices, so some thought was required on how to ensure they felt connected to their teams and to the organisation. A conversation might also be necessary to reflect on the optics of recruitment at a time when other industries were under financial pressure.
24. In relation to para 44 of the minutes, the Chair asked for 'much later' to be removed as phase 2 of the programme would be launched at the appropriate point.
25. In relation to para 55-60 on the Flybe decision, it was noted that the report would be corrected so as to provide an accurate description of the recent proceedings and regulatory decision.

26. The Board noted the report.

**V. FINANCE REPORT FOR THE TEN MONTHS TO 31 JANUARY 2021 (DOC 2021-23)
BY CHRIS TINGLE**

27. The COO provided an overview of the financial results for the month of January and noted the profit was adverse to the budget due to the s.12 grant, although there was still confidence that we would be on track to deliver the outcomes forecasted. The team was actively managing the P&L to meet the expected profit range for the year, accounting for cost savings made from having temporarily closed the Westferry office. The cash position was positive due to DfT's advance payment on the s.16 fees, low capex expenses and good working capital and cash flow. Overall, the year end results were likely to be better than the previous year, which was a positive outcome for the organisation, but would need clear explanation with industry.

28. The COO added that DfT had provided the letter that would enable the Board to be satisfied that the CAA remained a 'going concern' and had confirmed funding for security maturity and digitalisation. The Board congratulated Chris Tingle and Tim Johnson for maintaining a positive relationship with DfT and ensuring all critical issues were considered in the conversations.

29. The Board noted the report.

VI. HORIZON: TOM, VISION AND PRIORITY ENHANCEMENTS (DOC 2021-24) BY TIM JOHNSON

30. The Board welcomed Nic Stevenson as well as Joel Grundy and Chris Parson from Q5 to the meeting. The Chair noted that the discussion required the Board to confirm it agreed with the overall direction of travel, the interventions and the risks outlined.

31. The CEO set the scene for the topic, highlighting that interventions were likely to be well received by colleagues as several had been involved in their design, although it was still change and should be handled accordingly. It was important to ensure that agility, speed and flexibility of delivery were characteristics included in the strategy, and that the associated organisational structure was set up to reinforce the behaviours and culture we wanted to adopt, particularly in relation to the horizontal teams that would be required to progress work such as sustainability and innovation.

32. Today's discussion would require the Board's support on the broad vision of the characteristics of the organisation going forward, and on the first set of

enhancements, which would undertake a second iteration following feedback from this session. Key questions for debate included ways to take proportionate steps towards the one CAA approach and to create the mechanisms for colleagues to be mobilised to respond to ad hoc issues and projects. The next steps would require detailed work on the prioritisation process and any approvals were conditional to the budget discussion that was due to take place in April.

33. Overall, the Board supported the work and had the following comments.
- As well as talking about flexibility in the context of moving people to address issues as and when they arise, it should be interpreted as being able to respond while the environment inevitably changes. This distinction should be emphasised more in the vision piece.
 - An appropriate comms plan was required to ensure that the work was rolled out to colleagues in the best possible way, with simple language and concise, sharper presentation. The team explained that the key challenge for the comms plan would be to manage the change process when there were other priorities, by emphasising the benefits for colleagues and the improvements that it would bring to the organisation.
 - We seemed to be already invoking the one CAA approach to some of our organisational challenges, without a governance being in place setting out how the process would work. The team responded that the one CAA approach had been useful in a number of areas. The key external factors of a more proactive government, EU exit and Covid had meant that we were forced to find a creative way to address the challenges facing the organisation, without changing the legal framework. The model was focused on bringing teams together across functions and had already been started before the pandemic on work such as airspace modernisation. It was an attempt to harness the way of working that were effective during crises and the intention was to make an attempt to do that without having a strict set of processes in place, but using the Rapid Capability Office as a test bed.
 - There would need to be more clarity on the resources required to deliver the piece. The team responded that the Strategy, Planning, Prioritisation, Resourcing approach (SPPR) was a fundamental mechanism to bring teams together and highlight the priorities for ExCo, thus supporting the funding conversations and putting resourcing decisions in one place
 - There would need to be more clarity whether the new hub-and-spoke data model required us to change the way we managed data into a new system. The team responded that the intention was to bring together the data analysts

to encourage better collaborative working, to share the insights that would improve regulatory decisions, rather than implement a system-based change. It was people rather than IT-focused.

34. The team confirmed that all the comments would be considered in the work going forward.
35. The Board enquired whether the proposals to set up horizontal teams would have an impact on colleagues' job descriptions or affect roles. The team reassured the Board that the initial iterative change would concentrate on values and behaviours, although for a small number of people there would be a role change. However, although this work created the foundations for those changes, it was supplemented by the review of the grading structure and nomenclature that HR had conducted with a view to provide more visibility and transparency on this to colleagues. The review would also bring people with similar skills together, such as the Data Fellowship group. The team confirmed that changes to contracts were not required.
36. The Chair asked the Board to approve the vision and the enhancements and the Board endorsed the request, subject to the comments being taken into account.
37. The team noted that the next Board discussion would be in about six months' time, but that more frequent updates would be provided in the CEO report.
38. The Chair thanked the CAA team and the Q5 consultants for the work done so far and the ExCo for their continued engagement.
39. The Board noted the report.

VII. SARG MONTHLY SAFETY ISSUES (DOC 2021-25) BY ROB BISHTON

40. The Board welcomed Michael Cox, Peter Gardiner, Rob Olney, Sophie O'Sullivan, Mark Vincent, and Stuart Wain to the meeting.
41. The updated covered the Covid response work and the new Rapid Capability Office (RCO).
42. Covid response: our oversight models had been fit for purpose during periods of stability, however, to address the uncertainty the pandemic brought, a review was carried out to better take into account the changing requirements of industry. The shift focused on gathering intelligence and data, combined with evaluation of human factors, to form a total aviation system risk picture. The work had been successful and had received positive feedback from stakeholders. This new approach was not meant to be a solution to fit all needs, but a way to understand entities and their risks in the round, bringing more collaboration across teams and a deeper insight into the human component of industry's challenges.

43. During this work, the team recognised the climate was still uncertain and would be for a while and even when recovery started, it would happen at different paces and in different ways across the sector. The team also accepted it could not control stakeholders' risks, but would benefit from being more inquisitive and from continuous loop feedback.
44. Rapid Capability Office (RCO): the team had worked on the concept of an RCO before the pandemic, however, the Global Travel Task Force's April deadline meant that the various workstreams had to be pulled into a more coherent piece, to highlight the key issues and encourage industry to carry out scenario planning. This would be achieved by collaborative work across CAA and DfT's teams to create a panoramic view of the total aviation system. As part of the RCO, subgroups were set up to focus on three scenarios: cautious reopening, faster reopening through vaccines administration, and reopening maintaining existing infection controls. A report summarising the findings and the insights gathered would be ready in a few weeks.
45. The RCO had generated much interest from colleagues and once this work was completed, the team would evaluate what to tackle next, considering the suggestions received from around the organisation.
46. The Board was very supportive of the work carried out in both of these capabilities so far and had several comments, including the following.
 - The RCO was a great initiative, encouraging more aligned and more collaborative work between CAA, DfT and industry, however, we should focus on maintaining our position of regulator to deliver independent advice to government. The team explained that the purpose of the RCO was not to make recommendations to government, but to gather feedback from industry on the three scenarios and their associated challenges and opportunities, facilitating their consideration by government.
 - If we were no longer providing oversight based on performance, what were the metrics used and how were these communicated. The team responded that oversight practised before the pandemic was not suited to the current environment. As a consequence, we had been using our oversight capacity in more frequent albeit socially distanced engagement with entities – still based on the PBO principles - to understand their risk positions. However, oversight still took place in person at the entity's request or where we had an acute belief that there was an issue.
 - The new insights would help risk assessment, as the engagement was multi-faceted and took place across different levels, providing unique insights into

how industry had adapted by, for example setting up new training approaches and updating the Safety Management Systems. Stakeholders had started to ask different questions and share best practice in ways that we had not seen before.

- Being more forensic and more evidence-based was driving a more in-depth understanding of industry's risks, trends, and opportunities and how it was adapting. However, we did not yet have a full risk analysis, as the evidence available to date was not quantitative and still relatively subjective, given the current state of the industry. The focus was to better understand risk, so as to be able to address it and mitigate it. This was being achieved by looking at the system as a whole, to allow us to focus on the hotspots and suggest a way forward, all done with a clear evidence trail that set out our role and how we came to our position or decision. Such an approach was useful in assuring the Board the team had a method to track, control and issue alleviations and exemptions in SARG, but also in CMG, supplemented by clear communications to emphasise these were temporary.

47. The Chair asked the team to share with the Board the recommendations that would be provided to government in April, particularly around the assurance that our independent position had not been compromised by too close an engagement with industry.

ACTION: Rob Bishton

48. The Board noted the report.

VIII. GA POST-EASA OPPORTUNITIES CONSULTATION RESPONSE (DOC 2021-26) BY ROB BISHTON

49. The Board welcomed Neil Winbolt to the meeting.
50. The paper sought Board approval to undertake our recommended change programme in FY21/22 relating to the regulation of general aviation (GA) after EU exit. The programme had taken into account responses to our recent public consultation which highlighted a number of common themes from the community input and resulted in 50 recommendations to be addressed as part of the change programme. The team intended to publish the programme in detail in a consultation response document at the end of March, subject to the Board approval, which would show how the proposed activities closely aligned with the CAA GA Strategy 2018-2023.
51. The programme included a large number of projects. Consequently these had been categorised into three strategic priorities, which captured the overarching

themes highlighted by the consultation: the rationalisation and simplification of personnel licensing; the rationalisation and simplification of airworthiness maintenance regulation; and medical requirements. The team would return to the Board in 12 months with an update.

52. The Board was assured that simplification and rationalisation did not mean less regulation, but that areas with different, conflicting or duplicated regimes in place would be addressed, making the requirements clearer and more consistent. This in turn would improve safety. The team was in the process of running a number of roadshows to promote the approach and emphasise that it was not about deregulation but about making the framework less complex.
53. The Board supported the direction of travel and the approach and agreed that rationalisation should bring lower risks and improved safety. They encouraged the team to continue reflecting on our alignment with EASA post-EU exit, to design some effective KPIs to measure success and enquired about funding for those areas that would not be funded by DfT. On the latter, the team explained that GA funding was year-on-year, and that a business case would be required to secure the budget for all activities going forward. This would be supported by a set of KPIs, which were generated from capturing as much data as possible and feeding back to the community on a quarterly basis. Measuring progress and success was critical to understand resourcing, the risk profile, and the best reporting requirements.
54. The Chair asked the Board to approve the proposals and the Board endorsed the request, subject to regular progress reports and to being informed in advance if there is any intention to make decisions which might result in a divergence from EASA. The Board stated the importance of continuing alignment with ICAO, noting especially the imminent audit.
55. The Board noted the report.

IX. AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT (DOC 2021-27) BY GRAHAM WARD

56. Graham Ward noted that he did not have specific points to highlight to the Board on the recent Audit Committee, but that comments on the summary paper were welcome.
57. A query was raised in relation to para 'g' on the meaning of 'entrenched firefighting'. Mr Ward explained that the phrasing meant the team should seek more system solutions to issues, rather than focus on the problem in isolation, but added that it was not a widespread occurrence.

58. No other comments were received. The Chair thanked Mr Ward and the Committee for their work.
59. The Board noted the report.

X. HAL COVID-RELATED RAB SUBMISSION (DOC 2021-28) AND HAL's Q6 CAPEX REVIEW (DOC 2021-14) BY PAUL SMITH

60. The Board welcomed Stewart Carter, Jon Clyne and Mantas Aleksa to the meeting.

Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) Covid-related Regulatory Asset Based (RAB) submission

61. This discussion was a preamble for the decision that would take place at an extraordinary Board meeting in April and was aimed at providing a brief overview of the consultation response and capture feedback from the Board to inform the next steps. The team also noted that the operating environment for aviation was still challenging but with some cautious optimism.
62. The consultation had received 39 responses, including one from HAL who continued to support a request for a substantial RAB adjustment to be agreed before H7, and many from airlines, who continued to suggest an intervention was not required, although some indicated support of Package 1. The analysis was focusing on three key areas: HAL's compliance with its covenants, HAL's credit rating; and concerns around investment and service quality. The team would present policy options, pros and cons and a recommendation for decision at the extraordinary Board meeting in April.
63. The Board agreed that maintaining service quality was important to preserve consumer protection, that it needed robust quality assurance to support its decision in April, and that it was important to demonstrate the matter had been considered in detail and with a degree of urgency. The team suggested that a small number of Board members could meet with HAL and airline representatives to provide an additional opportunity to summarise their case. The Board agreed this was a good suggestion.

ACTION: Paul Smith

64. A discussion took place on the requirements to socialise our thinking and the team explained that engagement on this had taken place with HMT as part of other issues and that the relationship continued to be good.
65. The CEO noted that the matter was likely to draw attention from the media and asked the Board to refer all queries from journalists to the Communications Department.

HAL's Q6 Capex review

66. The paper was aimed at updating the Board on the latest developments on the review of HAL's Q6 capital expenditure (capex) and on the key emerging findings from the review and proposed forward plan. The review had been carried out to help provide assurance about the efficiency of HAL's capex and our recommendation included a modest reduction for inefficient expenditure during the current price control period, which would be deducted from HAL's RAB. The team explained that this was not the first instance that an ex-post efficiency review had been conducted, as such it was a widely used, tried and tested method. We had carried out internal and external engagement and called upon our technical advisors to support our analysis. We were closely aligned with the figures proposed by the advisors, which in themselves had been through rounds of discussions and challenges, including with the Independent Funds Surveyor (IFS).
67. However, this could potentially be controversial with stakeholders, as HAL may be concerned about a proposal to disallow some money they have already spent, while airlines would want to see a bigger reduction to reflect their concerns about the efficiency of expenditure. The team welcomed views from the Board, and noted that in the context of H7 there was work in progress to shift to an ex-ante approach going forward.
68. The Chair enquired whether the Board had any objections to the proposals and the Board agreed with the recommendations and approach.
69. The Board noted both reports.

XI. ISD PRIORITIES: CAA INFORMATION SECURITY AND CAF COMPLIANCE (DOC-2021-30) BY CHRIS TINGLE

70. The Board welcomed Matt Taylor and Ed Kent-Bending to the meeting.
71. The COO noted that, since the paper submission, DfT had confirmed funding for the programmes.
72. The team explained that CAA's cyber and security position had improved over the last few years: the recent Cyber Security Framework (CAF) audit had highlighted a number of issues and risks, including the need to transform our capability in the area and improve the way security was managed. These recommendations had now been completed and a risk management process had been introduced to quantify, address and prioritise risks, to better sequence the programme. Maturity and legacy risks, however, remained a challenge.
73. We had had to adapt the CAF to our organisation to ensure we could focus information security on the right areas and manage the multitude of systems we

- required to deliver out aims. The programme had been costed in a realistic way, using internal staff where practical and external partners to provide the necessary depth of knowledge when required. Funding would have to be renewed every year.
74. There were many important tasks in ISD that we needed to focus on, in addition to security and cyber, such as the work related to the Covid recovery and to data. As such, the team would welcome confirmation from the Board that the strategic priorities highlighted were the right ones.
75. The Board agreed that the programme was a strategic priority, but subject to understanding how it could be funded going forward. Some of the comments included the following.
- The programme should be afforded a high priority and we should continue to proceed, with the underlying principle that we required of ourselves the same standards we asked from others. It was also important to keep track of the risks identified and their developing paths.
 - Funding was problematic. Accordingly, the team should be more proactive in highlighting the cost of not doing the programme. We should also seek alternative sources of funding beyond DfT if possible, for example from cyber innovators. This was another example of the pressing need to change our funding model. The discussion at the ExCo had focused on the life cycle of the programme to understand whether the money was being employed on the right activities, where it brought benefits and without it being dependant on follow-up work.
76. The team explained that the information security programme had a focused risk framework that gathered intelligence from different sources, including the Cyber Security Information Sharing Partnership (CiSP) and the National Cyber Security Centre (NCSC). The data helped to build a risk picture, which was getting more effective and more mature. The team could flexibly sequence the delivery of activities based on the risks prioritised. The NCSC monitored our services to ensure we were not broadcasting vulnerabilities or had not been compromised and the programme had been specifically designed to address those risks, thus bringing maximum benefit. Compliance and maturity were the indicators of our progress.
77. Funding was required in full to reach whole compliance, however each project had been set up to bring benefit in a discrete and targeted way. Culture was an element of the ability to deliver and the team was starting to organise a training programme led by a dedicated member of staff. ExCo would be called upon to act as a role model.

78. The COO added that the organisation was availing itself of the cyber regulatory expertise we had in-house to advise us and to confirm that our prioritisation was appropriate. We were currently undergoing the procurement for external technical advisers.
79. The Chair asked the Board to endorse the strategic priority and the Board agreed, subject to the comments above.
80. The Board noted the report.

XII. WELLBEING STRATEGY II (DOC 2021-31) BY BEN ALCOTT

81. The Board welcomed Leo Capernaros to the meeting.
82. The organisation had made excellent progress in the past two years in supporting colleagues' wellbeing, so the new strategy would build on this foundation, review the challenges, opportunities and successes to boost the range of tools, guidance and resources that were available to staff. The four priorities that had been designed for the original strategy would remain in the new one as they had stood the test of time well during the pandemic. In addition, the new strategy would recognise not only the impact of the crisis but also the recovery phase, including reviewing future ways of working.
83. The Board was supportive and commented that anecdotal feedback indicated the wellbeing initiatives had been important in keeping staff resilient in this past year, particularly in the way that they could be accessed collectively or discretely. The challenge would be in the transition from crisis-mode to business as usual, which would require a more dynamic approach to wellbeing. The team responded that the new strategy recognised the importance of flexibility and had translated it into the offerings, with for example, virtual physio assessments and remote support tools.
84. The data gathered provided the general view, however, the team understood that, although it helped to set out the messages and resources in the right way, it provided only one perspective and more work was required to identify those individual cases that struggled to make themselves known.
85. The CEO emphasised that this was an important initiative with a great proposition by the team and that the organisation should provide full backing and a leading posture now and in the future.
86. The Chair asked the Board to endorse the recommendations and the Board agreed. The Chair thanked the team for their work.
87. The Board noted the report.

XIII. FORWARD AGENDA AND ANY OTHER BUSINESS

88. Forward Agenda: there were no comments on the Forward Agenda.

AOBs

89. The CEO mentioned that this would be Jonathan Nicholson's last Board before the new Director of Communications took up her post. He thanked Mr Nicholson for his excellent contribution.
90. The Chair offered AVM Ian Gale his and the Board's congratulations for his recent promotion to Air Marshal and for his role as Director General Joint Force Development in the UK
91. The Chair commented that future Board meetings would still be held virtually via Microsoft Teams, but that there was a possibility the awayday in July could be held in person. This would be confirmed nearer the time.

Date and Time of Next Meetings:

Wednesday 21 April 2021, 11:00 hours, on Microsoft Teams