

CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE 554th BOARD MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 16 JUNE 2021, 11:00, on Microsoft Teams

Present:

Sir Stephen Hillier

Chair

Richard Moriarty

Rob Bishton

Katherine Corich

AVM Simon Edwards

Marykay Fuller

David King

Anne Lambert

Paul Smith

Kate Staples

Secretary and General Counsel

Chris Tingle

Graham Ward

Apologies:

None

In Attendance:

Ben Alcott

Jane Cosgrove

Peter Drissell

Tim Johnson

Alex Kaufman

Philip Clarke

Barbara Perata-Smith

Minute-taker

Jenny Willott

for items 7

Maria Rueda

for item 8

David Tait

for item 8

Iain Libretto

for item 9

Jon Round

for item 10

I. APOLOGIES AND INTRODUCTIONS

1. No apologies were received.
2. The Chair welcomed AVM Simon Edwards who replaced AVM Iain Gale as the Ministry of Defence representative.

II. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, PREVIOUS MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

3. No new conflicts of interest were declared.
4. The minutes from the previous Board meeting were approved and would be published on the CAA website in due course.
5. The matters arising were reviewed and a number of actions highlighted to be closed.

III. CHAIR'S REPORT (DOC 2021-49) BY SIR STEPHEN HILLIER

6. The Chair summarised a number of headline points for discussion, including the Annual Report & Accounts, the Consumer Panel Annual Report, which would be presented by the Panel's Chair, Jenny Willott, and the paper on Innovation Advisory Services.
7. The draft agenda for the Board Awayday would also be discussed later in the meeting.
8. The Board noted the update.

IV. CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT (DOC 2021-50) BY RICHARD MORIARTY

Approvals

9. The CEO asked the Board to approve two items, as follows.
10. First, the CEO asked the Board to endorse the proposal to replace Kate Staples with Anna Bowles as the employer nominated trustee of the CAA Pension Scheme from 1 July 2021. This was due to Ms Staples leaving the CAA at the end of this calendar year which meant she would step down from her trustee role with effect from 30 June 2021. The Board approved the request.
11. Second, the CEO asked the Board to endorse the proposal to appoint Dr Mike Trudgill, currently Chief Medical Officer, as Responsible Officer (RO), a required role of the General Medical Council (GMC). Effective from 1 July 2021, this proposal was to replace Dr Sally Evans, the current GMC RO who would retire at the end of June 2021. The Board approved the request.

Live issues

12. Recovery and response: industry frustration has increased at the Government's plans to maintain the current RAG-based allocation system for countries, with a Judicial Review having been launched by a number of stakeholders in the aviation and travel sector over the effectiveness of the criteria used for allocating countries to RAG categories.
13. The delayed re-start to international travel meant the potential risk of a surge in the level of aviation activity, with its possible implications, had not materialised. However, the more prolonged the current restrictions, the more prominent the risk of skills fade and the financial situation faced by entities becoming critical.
14. The CEO explained that, although the main focus was on the effects of the crisis on human factors, the team was also concentrating on the engineering side and had responded quickly to an issue raised by the AAIB with regard to pitot tubes.
15. The CAA had gained a minor new role on Covid enforcement, in relation to arrivals from red countries being permitted only to dedicated terminals at Birmingham or Heathrow airports. The requirement was unlikely to be breached on the commercial passenger side of the sector, although there could be a slight risk with private jets, and in those cases, it would be immediately notified to CAA by Border Force. The team would write to all airports to provide instructions.
16. The Board discussed the further accretion of new Covid related enforcement roles, but the Board was reassured that this was only a minor increment to the existing role, with a very small additional resource and legal commitment, both funded by DfT.

Regulatory developments

17. The CEO provided a summary of the meeting that he and the Chair had attended with the Secretary of State (SoS). The discussion focused specifically on the Level 3 Case Handling Review process associated with the CAA's decision-making. The CAA had already taken action to more clearly identify a Level One process for airspace infringements, and would also have a Level Two process in place shortly. We had also previously identified to Ministers that we were considering a Level Three process for airspace infringements. This meeting focused on Level Three, which would be independent of both the CAA and other parties. The Secretary of State had agreed that this case handling review process should relate to private citizens, not commercial entities; that the process should be implemented as soon as practicable; and, importantly, that the scope of review should be procedural justice grounds rather than safety merits, given the vital importance of the CAA remaining the ultimate authority on safety across the system. It was also agreed that access to Level Three should have appropriate barriers, with an expectation

than only a handful of cases would be heard at this level, rather than it being the appeal by default. SoS directed that additional funding should be made available by the DfT to allow for implementation. We were now working to agree the Terms of Reference with DfT officials and an update would be provided to the Board in July.

18. The CEO updated the Board on the diversion of the Ryanair flight in Belarusian airspace. He noted the interest of the Transport Select Committee in the incident and what it might mean for aviation law and accepted international aviation protocols. He described the ongoing ICAO investigation into the facts and the rationale for the decisions taken by DfT and the CAA in relation to our issuing of two NOTAMs and the removal withdrawal of the Foreign Carrier Permits (FCPs) from certain operators.
19. The CEO and the Aviation Minister attended a Transport Select Committee Hearing on 15 June to discuss the situation.
20. Shoreham inquest: a brief overview of the developments on the Shoreham inquest was provided.

Internal issues

21. DfT audit: The CEO noted that DfT's Internal Audit function would conduct a routine review of how DfT conducted its sponsorship functions of CAA as an Arm's Length Body.
22. New medical system: The CELLMA implementation, which the Board was briefed on last month, was now proceeding more smoothly, with outstanding portal registration applications down to 1,400 from over 4,000. It would be a few weeks until the system was stabilised and the focus was on the wellbeing of the processing and project team, as well on communications to stakeholders, particularly to address points raised on data security.
23. A question was raised on whether regular lessons learnt sessions were held to ensure issues with implementation of new IT system could be understood. The team assured the Board that was the case and added that many system changes did not get reported because they tended not to encounter problems, so this was not a regular occurrence. In particular, the CAA team had managed to implement SAP and SuccessFactors successfully, the former being notorious for causing issues, showing the organisation definitely had the capability to integrate complex systems. The key point to note was that many systems needed to be customised for CAA operations rather than bought off the shelf which often brought snags.
24. The Chair noted that the KPIs included in the report for the SSC were mainly green and asked the team to reflect whether the right measures had been set, as

stakeholders experiencing delays in the processing might disagree with the green rating. The team observed that most licensing services were performing well, but the SSC has struggled with the incremental work caused by the CELLMA implementation and EU exit. However, they agreed to review the KPIs to be more reflective of the whole picture.

ACTION: Chris Tingle

25. Space: A question was raised in relation to media coverage on CAA's space regulation function, in particular, in relation to whether unlimited third-party liability for space activity would sit with government or innovators. The team explained that in anticipation of it taking up its space functions in summer 2021, the CAA was reaching out to all stakeholders, including Parliamentarians across the UK. The issue of unlimited third-party liability was a decision for Government (with whom any unlimited liability would rest), with CAA testing as part of the licencing process whether operators had the requisite level of insurance in place. The Government had undertaken a consultation on the draft insurance and liability framework, and a final position would be confirmed through the imminent approval of secondary legislative by Parliament. CAA now had the capacity, capability and a programme of work in place for fulfilling its new regulatory functions.
26. National Aviation Authorities Network: The Chair noted that the 5 NAAs Network had agreed that the UK would lead the group for the first two years.
27. The Board noted the report.

V. FINANCE REPORT FOR THE ONE MONTH TO 30 APRIL 2021 (DOC 2021-51) BY CHRIS TINGLE

28. The COO noted that there had been a good start to the financial year with positive variances thanks to a combination of revenue, for example from personnel licences and AOCs, and cost control, including staff costs as the CAA is under budget on headcount.
29. Staff resourcing was recently discussed by ExCo and, in particular, the variance between actual and our budgeted headcount. There were no immediate areas of concern and it was noted that there had been some frontloading of approved vacancies for the full financial year.
30. There had been a request from DfT to update the organisation's s.12 grant forecast for 2021/22, including a BAU forecast for the next three years. The key variable in the figures would be passenger volumes, in line with the estimated recovery timeline. DfT were not in a position to share an updated forecast yet, to allow CAA to reflect this in the s.12 forecast. The team had decided to err on the

side of caution and use a medium to worst-case scenario in the forecast, as there was a short deadline for submission. The assumption for next year's budget would be one of no significant changes to our scheme of charges.

31. Discussion took place on the feasibility of building inflation into the charges and whether a forecast with and without inflation should be provided. The team's understanding was that any increase would not be well received by the aviation sector that is so financially challenged. The Board supported this position, but asked the team to produce figures for the two options, with inflation included in our employment costs.

ACTION: Chris Tingle

32. Other questions were raised about the direction and timing of the next Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) and to understand the next steps to produce updated financial forecasts for CAA. The team explained that the themes for the CSR would be presented at the July Board meeting and that an early discussion about the issues and options for a new financial model would be had with external stakeholders in the form of the next Financial Advisory Committee (FAC) in July. Once feedback had been received, the budgeting process would be factored in and the proposal published for consultation for stakeholders.
33. The Board noted the report.

VI. CAA ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS (DOC 2021-52) BY CHRIS TINGLE

34. The COO presented the draft CAA Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 March 2021, giving the Board an overview of the CAA's performance and noting that the key factor impacting the organisation's position had been the pandemic and the grant funding arranged by DfT. The audit carried out by BDO, which had been completed remotely, had been positive, with no adjustments required and had drawn assurance from the letter of comfort issued by DfT.
35. There were two reporting changes in this year's Annual Report. The document reported on the Streamlined Energy and Carbon Reduction (SECR) framework, disclosing the organisation's emissions, and also reported compliance with S172 of Companies Act.
36. The Chair of the Audit Committee noted that the Committee had approved the external audit plan and considered and accepted the External Audit Completion report.
37. The Audit Committee had also done the following:

- Paid special attention to the accounting and disclosure of pensions, selection of accounting principles and policies, going concern and viability and potential impairment of intangible assets.
 - Reviewed several drafts of the ARA, including the Growth Duty Annex and the new reporting on S172 and on our environmental performance, suggested amendments and reviewed the current version to confirm that those amendments had been made.
 - Noted that there were a very small number of amendments to the ARA not in the Board papers but that were in the version to be signed, including that DfT had agreed that we could correct their published letter for typos and factual inaccuracies.
 - Considered whether there were any subsequent events between the AC meeting and today which required noting in or amending in the ARA and accepted that there were none.
 - Considered the representation letter to BDO: the purpose of this letter was to give comfort to BDO on matters that were relevant to the ARA in respect of completeness of information.
 - Considered the letter from the CEO, COO and General Counsel to the Board in respect of the representation letter. The purpose of this letter was for the Board to receive assurance from senior management that it has received complete, relevant information in respect of the approval of the ARA.
38. The Chair of the Audit Committee commented that, subject to no new information emerging at today's Board meeting which required any changes, BDO were content to sign their audit report in the form in which it appeared in the Board papers. The Board confirmed that there was no new information that should be considered.
39. The Chair of the Audit Committee then asked the Board to consider the draft representation letter and, in particular, the sections on the going concern, the laws and regulations; the post balance sheet events, the fraud and error; the related party transactions and the litigation and claims. The Board and the General Counsel confirmed they were content with all of the above sections of the ARA.
40. The Chair asked the Board to confirm there were no comments or questions on the ARA and the Board confirmed that was the case.
41. The Chair of the Audit Committee said that the Audit Committee recommended that the Board authorised the Chair and the Company Secretary to sign the representation letter to BDO and that it authorised the CEO and the COO to sign the ARA on its behalf. The Board authorised those requests.

42. The Chair of the Audit Committee thanked the auditors and the team for their excellent work on the ARA and congratulated them on BDO finding no adjustments to make.
43. The Board noted the report.
44. Appointment of auditors: Mr Ward explained that there was a requirement to retender for the company auditors every four years. The paper contained the recommendation that the external audit contract was awarded to BDO LLP for the next three years, plus one, for the sum specified in the document. If endorsed by the Board, the recommendation would then go to the Secretary of State for formal approval.
45. The Chair asked the Board if it had any objections to the proposal and the Board approved the recommendation, as specified.
46. The Chair thanked Mr Ward for all the work done and the guidance provided to the Board to get the organisation to this point.

VII. CONSUMER PANEL ANNUAL REPORT (DOC 2021-53) BY JENNY WILLOTT

47. The Board welcomed Jenny Willott, the Chair of the CAA Consumer Panel, and Harriet Gamper to the meeting. Ms Willott presented the key insights from the Panel's Annual Report. These included the following.
 - Work on economic regulation for Heathrow Airports and NATS, where the Panel had built an excellent relationship with the team over the year.
 - Work on consumer vulnerability where the Panel had supported the team in agreeing a definition of vulnerability which was adopted by CAA and was in the process of being implemented.
 - Research on consumer confidence following the Covid restart, which was challenging and had to be reviewed several times due to lockdown being in place at various points in the year. The final report was published at the same time as the Government's report on the Global Travel Taskforce (GTT). The Panel had engaged with many teams across the CAA to deliver views that were helpful and constructive, although it recognised that many of the levers required to make a difference rested with parties outside the CAA.
 - Work on environmental information provision, which was an example of a particularly good relationship between the Panel and the CAA team involved. The Panel was engaged early in the project and two of the members contributed to the deliberative consumer research that had been commissioned.

48. The Chair opened the discussion for comments and a question was raised on whether the CAA could do more to support consumer confidence, once travel was again possible. The Board was advised that the key area that was within CAA's remit was the type of information to which consumers had access. The GTT had produced the Passenger Charter, which, while very comprehensive, was a long and complicated document that a consumer might find difficult to navigate. CAA could provide a useful contribution in ensuring the information is easily found, accessible and consistent, at least up to the point of booking. The team added that the challenge lay in doing more and better without merely signposting to the relevant information sources, which the Passenger Charter had already done. It was suggested that it was important the CAA did not cut across official Government communications which would add rather than ameliorate passenger confusion. It agreed the CAA should engage with DfT on this issue with a view to pursuing the Consumer Panel's objective.

ACTION: Paul Smith, Alex Kaufman

49. The report seemed to focus primarily on the direct consumer-facing functions and a comment was made on whether the Panel had engaged successfully with other teams at CAA besides CMG. The Panel's Chair recognised that, although most of the work was done with CMG, it had also collaborated with AvSec, who were very good at considering consumers in their work, CSP on the environmental information provision, the Passenger Advice and Complaints Team on consumer complaints, SARG on consumer confidence and the Innovation Hub to have visibility of and contribute views to their key projects. The Chair added that as the Panel had already been involved in the environmental information provision work, and considering the Board awayday would be on sustainability, it should stay connected, as the former would feature at the session.
50. A question was raised about the increasing debate generated by the diminishing traffic at regional airports in favour of the larger airports. The Panel's Chair commented that first, this had been one of the fallouts of Covid: people's lifestyle had changed, resulting in less travelling, particularly for business who were probably the heaviest users of local airports. Second, there was still not enough understanding of what consumers thought and how this translated into action (the stated versus revealed preferences), as well as whether these behaviours would generate different purchasing decisions. And third, although the Panel did not cover the overflow, those who did not fly were included through the work on accessibility and vulnerability: these consumer groups had fared better during the pandemic and it would be interesting to monitor whether this would continue in the

recovery phase. It was still too early to understand how these issues would develop after Covid.

51. A comment was made that the Panel should be aware of the rapidly evolving aviation industry service offerings and business models, as they would be likely to come market quickly. The Panel's Chair noted that the Innovation Hub was scheduled to present at the October Panel meeting on emerging technologies to discuss how the consumer angle could be incorporated in the regulatory framework required and at the early stage of the development of new technologies. This was particularly relevant for people with disabilities and it would be more easily done earlier than later.
52. The Chair thanked Ms Willott for her work as Chair of the Panel, for the work of the Panel as a whole, and for challenging the CAA as appropriate.
53. The Board noted the report.

VIII. ENABLING INNOVATION: INNOVATION ADVISORY SERVICES (DOC 2021-54)

54. The Board welcomed Maria Rueda and David Tait to the meeting.
55. The Chair set out the purpose of the discussion and noted there were three points to help frame the discussion: first, whether the Board was still supportive of the CAA continuing to take a leading role creating the conditions for encouraging innovation in the sector, the answer to which was positive as the CAA's Innovation Hub had been in place for a while and was continuing to do valuable and recognised work; second, an acknowledgement that the risks highlighted at the last conversation on this issue at the February Board should be clarified in today's session, including the proposed steps to mitigate against unacceptable levels of risk and protect the CAA's regulatory principles; and third, the discussion should focus on the core principles of the proposal, rather than the granular operational aspects, albeit the team would welcome any guidance on the latter to help it develop a more detailed implementation plan.
56. The team explained that there was a challenge and opportunity for the organisation to remain relevant in a fast-moving environment increasingly populated by new to aviation and well-funded operators and to remain aligned Government's ambitions. The specific challenge was that many of these new operators were not currently in the regulatory system and were not therefore funding regulatory development activity. The proposal being presented to the Board for approval was to introduce new paid for innovation advisory services that would available to any company before it made a formal regulatory application to the CAA, and would cease before any such application was made. These services

would involve providing advice on which regulatory frameworks were relevant to the innovator and examples of risks that would need to be mitigated, but would strictly not involve preparing regulatory applications. These services would be provided on the user-pays principle. These new services would be provided by CAA's International Group/CAAi, but would allow general learnings from these activities to be shared with CAA's regulatory teams, so they could learn about the innovations coming to market and help them prepare and consult publicly on future regulatory frameworks. This model was consistent with the CAA's new Target Operating Model (TOM), endorsed recently by the CAA Board. Our international benchmarking suggested that other authorities either had, or were close to, moving into this space such as the FAA and EASA.

57. To be able to operate effectively and deliver appropriate governance around internal separation between advisory and regulatory roles, the membership and scope of the existing Innovation Steering Board would be expanded. It would now oversee the development and implementation of the services, provide governance and challenge. The team also discussed its proposal to include an element of independent review of the effectiveness of the controls established to ensure regulatory principles were not compromised with the development of the new activity.
58. In the discussion, the Board provided a number of comments, as follows.
 - It was important to preserve the independence of CAA's regulatory decision making and create an appropriate and credible degree of internal structural and procedural separation of activities to manage conflicts of interest, particularly in relation to the use of scarce Subject Matter Experts.
 - Implementation was key and until the services were working smoothly, six-monthly reports to the Board on progress and assurance would be valuable.
 - This was an opportunity to educate new market entrants on aviation.
 -
59. AVM Edwards noted that the Air Force was dealing with similar challenges and offered to be involved in the work to draw parallels and learning, which the team accepted.

ACTION: AVM Simon Edwards, Ben Alcott, Tim Johnson, Rob Bishton
60. The team commented that the checks in place would deliver an appropriate degree of separation between advisory and regulatory activities. Further expertise could also be drawn from academia if required. They added that the CAA could decline any request to provide services that might create unacceptable levels of regulatory risk.

61. The Chair invited the Board to endorse the proposal on the basis of the mitigations described in the paper, due consideration being given to the comments above and the Board being updated initially every six months on progress with the new services and how the risks were being mitigated. The team agreed to flag up any issues as applicable.

ACTION: Ben Alcott, Tim Johnson, Rob Bishton

62. The Board endorsed the recommendations in the paper.

IX. ANNUAL RISK REVIEW (DOC 2021-56) BY TIM JOHNSON

63. The Board welcomed Iain Libretto to the meeting who explained that today's session would focus on understanding whether the risks covered were the right ones, reviewing the risk profile and the risk management framework.

64. On the latter, the model had stood up well to the challenges brought by the Covid pandemic and had been adapted to reflect those. It was linked to the activities on the business plan and was tested regularly by the Audit Committee.

65. The Chair asked the Board to offer views on whether the risk maps were complete and there were no other risks that should be added to the framework at this stage. The Board confirmed that was the case.

66. The Chair then asked for comments on the strategic risks highlighted in the heat maps.

67. A number of risks had target dates that were over 12 months and a question was raised on whether there was a plan that illustrated how the risks were likely to decline over time. Similarly, for changes of status – from likely to unlikely – within less than three months, a question was asked to understand better the driver for this change, for example in relation to risk 3 on concurrent strategic challenges. The team explained that whilst the number of concurrent strategic challenges was likely continue, a more in depth understanding of these issues had been acquired and this, together with the new TOM, the work of the Rapid Capabilities Office and the Innovation Hub, would allow the CAA to be more agile and responsive and thus this ability would reduce the impact of the risk in question.

68. Risk 9 on legal obligations would require additional mitigations to address the departure, at the end of this year, of the General Counsel. The CEO reassured the Board that the legal team was multi-disciplinary and was competent in advising on different elements of the law. Furthermore, the General Counsel intended to remain in post until a replacement had been found and some handover carried out. Specifically, there were several pieces of work in place which would help lower the risk, such as the aviation legislation programme, wargaming the regulatory

framework to understand better what was fit for purpose and what could be downplayed.

69. The team also provided clarity on the day-to-day management of risks, explaining that, at a local level, each risk owner was accountable for delivering the risk mitigation according to a specific target date, which had been agreed for specific reasons. Adhering to target dates required discipline, and when occasionally optimism bias shifted the dial the risk manager was in place to flag and correct.
70. The business risks on heat map 4 were discussed and an update in six months requested for all risks, paying particular attention to target dates.

ACTION: Tim Johnson, Iain Libretto

71. The Chair thanked Mr Libretto for his work and for presenting so succinctly and clearly.
72. The Board noted the report.

X. SARG MONTHLY SAFETY ISSUES REPORT (DOC 2021-55) BY ROB BISHTON

73. The Board welcomed Jon Round to the meeting.
74. An overview of the slides was provided, emphasising the top risks listed, and the additional topical risks not normally socialised. The key problem statements the SARG Senior Leadership Team had been studying were as follows.
 - Being able to identify the more prolonged impact of Covid, focusing the conversation on the longer-term recovery.
 - Applying necessary rigour to creating audit trail and focus on past events to ensure learnings reduce chance of repeat events and/or a serious event.
 - Being able to shape the expertise the organisation possessed to understand and support the safety activity now but also in the future.
75. Furthermore, the team had additional challenges: first, intelligence gathering for assurance activities was still in progress, but carried out differently from before Covid; second, SARG's enforcement role with industry was still required but should be balanced with educating the sector on what was required of them; and third, work was in progress to address the minor non-compliance identified at the recent audit. Additional information on incidents and other live issues was included in the report's annexes.

Topical issues

76. Capacity pinch points: the Rapid Capabilities Office (RCO) had been tasked to support the new Operational Recovery Taskforce with building a dashboard to model and predict airport capacity pinch points, as the recovery began. This had come from a concern that the traffic light system was causing queues for both

passengers at terminals, but also aircrafts on taxiways, generating possible diversions and operational impacts. The dashboard was designed to provide information on the pinch points up to three weeks in advance and it worked by considering the whole aviation system, including Border Force limitations, rather than just traffic flows.

77. The data had been shared only with relevant airports and limited to their own information to protect confidentiality and to prevent operational decision made at local level. The information would be socialised with government as they had expressed an interest in the work.
78. Impact of pandemic on smaller aerodromes: large and regional airports had downsized and recapitalised through the pandemic to remain operational, for example by closing terminals and furloughing staff. Smaller aerodromes had tended to operate with less staff even before Covid and were now experiencing some difficulty, which had come to light through a mixture of whistle-blower reports and increased routine oversight visits. The team were working hard with the aerodromes to help resolve the issues identified.
79. These were example of the types of challenges that had resulted from the pandemic, where the team had to think creatively and apply proportionate measures to address the problems, working in conjunction with DfT.
80. A question was raised on the complexity to reinstating air traffic services and whether the CAA could accelerate the process with targeted interventions. The team replied that the organisation was being very flexible and working constructively with the sector, as well as continuing to focus on BAU other activities. One of these was in regard to aircraft engine resilience and the team was in the process of carrying out an analysis of how the trend had developed in the past five years.
81. The Chair asked for a briefing on these issues, to prepare for an upcoming meeting with the Minister.

ACTION: Rob Bishton

81. The Board noted the report.

XI. OVERVIEW OF THE DRAFT BOARD AWAYDAY AGENDA (NO PAPER) BY TIM JOHNSON

82. The Chair noted that the July Board would be held virtually on Microsoft Teams, due to the restrictions being extended. The Board Awayday would be postponed to September when it would hopefully be held in person. The Business Manager would circulate dates for the event at the earliest convenience.

ACTION: Philip Clarke

83. The team provided an overview of the draft awayday agenda and explained that the first session was designed to stimulate discussion on the CAA's role, responsibilities and ambition on sustainability of the sector, in order to consider future regulatory frameworks, policies and strategies. Speakers would inform the conversation with their external perspectives. A suggestion was raised to bring the external sessions forward to the July Board to set the context and to find a speaker able to paint a picture of how aviation fits in the environment space in relation to other sectors.

ACTION: Tim Johnson

84. The Board noted the update.

XII. FORWARD AGENDA INCLUDING DRAFT JULY BOARD AGENDA

85. The Board was briefed on the content of upcoming meetings. On the Forward Agenda, it was noted that the key paper would be the one exploring the CAA's decision-making framework for appeals.

XIII. AOB

86. The Chair noted that the July Board would be the last meeting for Graham Ward and David King.
87. Peter Drissell celebrated Sophie Hibbins' successful crossing of the Atlantic in an 8-person rowing team.
88. A request was raised to see a report on the projects worked on by the Innovation team, for visibility.

ACTION: Tim Johnson

Date and Time of Next Meetings:

Wednesday 14 July 2021, 11:00 hours, on Microsoft Teams