MINUTES OF THE FIFTY THIRD MEETING HELD AT 11.00 HRS ON 22 JANUARY 2013 AT RUTHERFORD APPLETON LABORATORY REDACTED VERSION

Council Members present: Michael Sterling (Chairman) 
Gill Ball
Martin Barstow
Marshall Davies
Julia Goodfellow
Michael Healy
David Price
James Stirling
Ian Taylor
Will Whitehorn (by telephone)
John Womersley

Dept Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS): Graeme Reid

In Attendance: Gordon Stewart (Executive Secretary to Council and Executive Director, Corporate Services)
Tim Bestwick (Executive Director, Business and Innovation)
Grahame Blair, (Executive Director, Programmes
Sharon Cosgrove (Executive Director, Strategy, Performance and Communications)
Andrew Taylor (Executive Director, National Laboratories)
Jane Tirard (Executive Director, Finance)
Matt Griffin, (Chair, Science Board)
Alison Davenport, (Deputy Chair, Science Board)

Sharon Bonfield (Council Secretariat and Minute Secretary)

1. WELCOME AND CONFLICTS REGISTER OF INTEREST

1.1. The Chairman welcomed all attendees to the meeting. There were no apologies; Will Whitehorn attended by telephone. Alison Davenport, Deputy Chair of Council attended with Matt Griffin, Chair of Science Board.

1.2. Mike Sterling was pleased to announce that 2 Council members’ terms had been renewed; Gill Ball for a further term of 3 years and Marshall Davies for a further term of 2 years. Mike Healy would be coming to the end of his term in March 2013; an appointment process was underway
to select and appoint a replacement.

1.3. John Womersley was pleased to announce that Mike Sterling had accepted re-appointment for a further 4 years as Chair of Council; Council congratulated Mike on his re-appointment.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND REGISTER OF INTERESTS

2.1. The Chairman asked Council members to declare any conflicts of interest and reminded members to keep the Executive Secretary informed of any changes to their personal register of interests.

2.2. Alison Davenport who is Deputy Chair of Science Board was in attendance; Alison Davenport has institutional conflicts of interest with the University of Birmingham, but is in the School of Metallurgy and Materials so does not therefore, have a departmental or programme conflict with any STFC physics programmes. Alison is the principal investigator for DIAD Beamline on Diamond Light Source, Science Director of the Harwell Imaging Partnership, one of STFC’s Centres.

3. CORPORATE SERVICES DIRECTORATE (CSD) REVIEW PROJECT UPDATE

Some references in this section have been redacted as protect:management

3.1. Gordon Stewart updated Council on the status of the CSD Review project and the schedule for completion; implementation timescales will be determined by the options that are selected. Gordon reminded Council of the drivers behind the review and the opportunity that it provided to shape the directorate’s future and become more strategic.

3.2. Council were informed of the appointment of 2 new specialist change leaders in CICT and Estates, who had been appointed on a 1 year fixed term, to assist with the review and implementation.

3.3. A restructuring process of the senior level was planned (Heads of Departments), to reflect the more corporate and strategic focus of these roles. The new structure will reduce the number of “Heads Of Department” positions reporting into the Executive Director, Corporate Services by 1. EB were still due to approve the selection process but Gordon anticipated that the process would be complete by the end of March 2013.

3.4. Gordon stated that the outline business case was scheduled to be finalised at the end of March 2013 and would be reviewed by EB in April 2013; final Council approval is scheduled for May 2013. The outline business case will provide a basis for narrowing to preferred option(s) and will be the basis for further investigation and detailed feasibility/implementation planning. The outline business case was coming together, with work underway to progress the financial modelling and evidence through soft market testing.
3.5. Gordon outlined the types of options that the business case would contain:

- **Option 1** - do nothing and maintain the “as is” situation as at April 2012.
- **Option 2** - identify means of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the current “as is” situation but without a fundamental change of approach, including optimising the current mix of outsourced services vs. in house, by clarifying scope of services to optimise delivery and efficiencies.
- **Option 3** - Improved service delivery. Will standardise delivery platforms across sites and functions, with greater outsourcing.
- **Option 4** – Outsourced. All of Option 2 plus: all transactional service is outsourced leaving slim, strategic management focus and core expertise in-house.

3.6. Gordon informed Council that this review is robust and will provide challenging options. Once EB and Council have made the decision about which option to proceed with, further more detailed analysis will be undertaken before final implementation.

3.7. In discussion, Council considered the benefits of the Price Waterhouse Coopers report for the provision of benchmarking for this review, as well as the credibility provided by newly appointed change leaders. Council questioned the drivers for the review and whether the intention was to be more efficient and effective or to save money and concluded that choices will need to be made that will balance greater savings with the cost of effectiveness and change.

3.8. Council asked about earlier plans considered by John Womersley to combine Finance with Corporate Services Department. John stated that now was not the time to lose focus on finance with the uncertainty in the lead up to the CSR.

3.9. Council discussed how this review fitted in with the RCUK harmonisation agenda and whether scope for savings by working with other Research Councils had been explored. Council noted that STFC needs to get its own house in order before exploring the wider harmonisation agenda. The Executive reassured Council that they are however, keeping a very close eye on, and are fully engaged with, developments in RCUK.

4. **SCIENCE BOARD UPDATE** SOME REFERENCES IN THIS SECTION HAVE BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT: MANAGEMENT

4.1. Matt Griffin reported to Council on the business from the Science Board meeting held on 12 and 13 December 2012 and Council noted the
4.2. Science Board had received reports from the Projects Peer Review Panel (PPRP) at its December meeting on the ATLAS and CMS upgrades at CERN and the SuperNEMO commissioning and sensitivity demonstration.

4.3. The Large Hadron Collider (LHC) plans two stages of upgrades to increase significantly its discovery potential. Phase I, starting after the 2017/18 shutdown, and followed by Phase II after the 2021/22 shutdown. Upgrades to both the ATLAS and CMS experiments are required to cope with the higher luminosities and clarity was required by international collaborators on the UK position, especially for Phase I, soon.

4.4. Science Board had considered that the PPRP had carried out a thorough and robust technical review (focusing on Phase I only, as Phase II had not yet been approved by CERN). Science Board concluded that there was a strong science case for continuing UK participation in both experiments, based on science return, leadership and international expectations and had endorsed PPRP’S recommendation to fund both experiments but at a sub-optimal level to create headroom for FY 14-19 for other particle physics experiments; ATLAS and CMS alone could “easily swallow up” all particle physics funding within the STFC programme.

4.5. The ATLAS team had requested £45M and the CMS team £17M (the former figure being considerably in excess of the planning guidelines which came out of the 2009 Programmatic Review, where a best guess estimate was made of the amount that would be needed).

4.6. PPRP had recommended that ATLAS was funded at 50% except for WP7 (L-1 calorimeter trigger) at 70% and CMS at 60% which was equal to the request but with WP4, Pixel DAQ deleted. This level of funding would provide both teams with viable funding support for Phase I, although it may mean that it would take longer to complete.

4.7. Science Board had also endorsed provision of limited support for Phase II R & D in the first year only, pending the Programmatic Review outcome and further clarification of the science case, cost and schedule.

4.8. The LHC upgrades are one of the top priorities for the Particle Physics Advisory Panel with both experiments being rated Alpha 5 in the 2009 prioritisation, however Council understood Science Board’s disappointment that, in their view, sufficient detail had not been provided on the very strong scientific justification that existed for each project in the proposals and report to the PPRP, including justification for why there is a need for UK involvement in both experiments. Science Board itself had reviewed this and were satisfied as to the strength of the scientific case. [James Stirling declared an interest at this point, as his
institution is involved in both projects and would benefit from any investment in these projects]. Council agreed with Science Board’s concern that the scientific justification for involvement in both ATLAS and CMS had always to be made explicit, and agreed that not doing so could be reputationally damaging and that this should be fed back to the teams through Science Board/PPRP.

**Action:** Science Board/PPRP

4.9. In discussion concerns were raised about the possible loss of leadership that may arise from sub-optimal funding but it was concluded that other EU countries were experiencing similar funding issues.

4.10. Council also noted that Science Board had endorsed PPRP’s funding recommendation for SuperNEMO commissioning and sensitivity demonstration, dependent on the confirmation of the balance of funding being received from France.

4.11. Science Board had also considered two statements of interest: Science Board had recommended that an application for MoEDAL is submitted to the Particle Physics Theory Grants Round and that SOLiD project is submitted to the PPRP in parallel with the Programmatic Review if necessary.

4.12. Science Board had received a report from the Advisory Panel for Public Engagement and from the Accelerator Strategy Board which included reviews of ASTeC and the Cockcroft Institute and continued work on the STFC Accelerator Roadmap.

4.13. Science Board received an update from the Executive on plans for supporting open access to research publications, and expressed a preference for fostering the culture for green open access; the importance of effective data archiving was stressed by Science Board. David Price asked to re-emphasise the debate on Open Access and the pressure on universities to meet additional article publishing costs out of fEC and what is effectively a reduction in activities. John Womersley reported that RCUK have a preference for gold open access and the process of making everything RCUK compliant is taking time and is being driven to some extent by AHRC who have particular publishing needs.

4.14. Matt updated council on the status of the Programmatic Review which was running effectively, and according to schedule. All subgroups were active and have met at least once and initial outputs from the advisory panels have been received. Science Board had reviewed the sub-group outputs and discussed the format of the final Programmatic Review report, the process by which the balance of programme will be addressed and the information that it requires to do this. At its next meeting on 21 and 22 February 2013, Science Board will be receiving more detailed
reports from each sub-group and a more detailed report will be provided to Council at its next meeting in March 2013.

4.15. The Large Facilities Sub-Group (LFS) have been asked to provide input as part of STFC’s process to develop options for the Large Facilities Funding Model (LFFM). In particular, they had emphasised the need for a balance between facility types and between national and international facilities, noting that the national and international neutron and x-ray large facilities had been developed to be complementary to one another.

4.16. The sub-group also stated that there was an urgent need for a strategic overview of neutron, x-ray and laser science including opportunities at ESS, FELs. Matt went on to state that the LFS had highlighted that the LFFM is the root of the problem which was conceived when the funding landscape was different.

4.17. The LFS would be considering Free Electron Lasers (FEL) access at its next meeting and making an interim recommendation to the Executive regarding the UK’s reengagement; it was Science Board’s opinion that future access to FELs should be part of the science strategy.

4.18. Science Board had discussed the process and procedures in the recent Astronomy Grants Round. Science Board noted that the quality of research was very high, with some world-class proposals not being funded due to budget constraints and the strong belief of the Astronomy Grants Panel (AGP) that overall funding for astronomy would need to be increased in order to sustain UK prominence. Science Board had endorsed the panel’s recommendations but had some concerns about the process.

4.19. Grants panels have guidelines and are expected to operate within a way that Science Board is comfortable with and whilst respecting the autonomy of the grants panels, Science Board had expressed some concerns; about different approaches to core posts and fEC allocation; the AGP policy of assessing institute applications project by project without consideration of thematic coherence; the current imbalance of applications over the three year cycle. Council supported Science Board’s concerns and were pleased to hear that these will be taken into account when reviewing the Consolidated Grant Schemes. Council noted that the Particle Physics Grants Panel is felt to take a more flexible approach to fEC. [Secretary’s note: Martin Barstow declared a conflict of interest as a recipient of an Astronomy Consolidated Grant]. Martin Barstow commented that there needed to be a consideration of the balance between funding exploitation and investment, and this would come out in the Programmatic Review as it will look at the balance between experimental and exploitation grants.
5. ISLAND SITES UPDATE SOME REFERENCES IN THIS SECTION HAVE BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT:POLICY

5.1. In May 2012, following detailed review by the Science Board, STFC Council endorsed its recommendations concerning the future of the island site telescopes. In Hawaii, operation of UKIRT will continue until Sept 2013, and the JCMT until Sept 2014. For the JCMT, this allows a substantial part of the SCUBA-2 science programme to be completed. New owners will be sought for these facilities and work is ongoing with the Director and his staff to manage our withdrawal.

5.2. The JAC withdrawal is being overseen by an independent working group. Over 10 expressions of interest in UKIRT have been received of which a few are currently being pursued, seeking more information. The current plan foresees a decision on whether these are viable by end March 2013. If not, UKIRT will close in September 2013.

5.3. A prospectus for the JCMT will be issued in the spring this year. Work is also progressing on reduced operational cost models for the JCMT, in support of this. Funds for decommissioning will be available with BIS approval (~£4M for both facilities).

5.4. Support for ING will be extended until March 2015 to give time for negotiations with international partners to be completed and the proposed WEAVE instrument to be considered The ING future is being overseen by an independent negotiating team. The new instrument for the WHT (WEAVE) will be reviewed by Science Board in Spring 2013, following its own cost and design review. Partners are UK, Spain, NL, France.

5.5. Council noted the update and were reassured that the Astronomy community were being kept informed throughout the process through the Astronomy Forum. Some community members have expressed their unhappiness with the timetable but John Womersley stated that the timetable that is being followed is consistent with earlier recommendations from community review panels.

6. CAMPUS UPDATE THIS ITEM HAS BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT:COMMERCIAL

7. CHANCELLOR'S AUTUMN STATEMENT

[Secretary’s note: Alison Davenport declared a conflict of interest – principal-investigator for DIAD Beamline on Diamond Light Source].

7.1. John Womersley updated Council on the total £600 million to be invested in facilities for technological R & D and Research Council infrastructure
that was announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Autumn Statement.

7.2. A total of £484M was allocated to the Research Councils, of which STFC’s share is £80.7m which must be spent in 13/14 and 14/15.

7.3. Executive Board had agreed that the money should be split fairly between universities investment and estates and facilities investment at Daresbury and RAL:

- Campus investment – including space cluster building at Harwell - £35m
- Advanced materials – DIAD Diamond beamline - £5m
- Big data and energy efficient computing - £30m (comprising £11m for SKA computing and £19m for energy efficient computing)
- State of the art equipment - £10.7m

7.4. BIS have requested that a business case is developed for each investment area which will be written by RCUK leads, with the exception of campuses where they want an individual business case from STFC and one from BBSRC.

7.5. No announcements have been made yet but the Chancellor of Exchequer was expected to visit Daresbury Laboratory on 1 February 2013.

7.6. RCs have started to develop ideas in preparation should more capital become available in the Spring Statement.

7.7. Council members questioned the ongoing resource implications for these investments. In some areas such as SKA there are no operating costs associated with the investment but the DIAD will have ~£800k operating costs over several years, energy efficient computing is not a new machine but focusing on low power solutions for existing machines. The Executive assured Council that this problem is widely recognised and BIS are well aware from lobbying by RCUK, that capital is not optimal if not accompanied by resource.

8. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

8.1. Council approved the minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2013 and the Chairman signed these as a true record of that meeting.

8.2. Council were satisfied that the redacted minutes presented to Council would be suitable for publishing on the STFC website.

9. ACTIONS AND MATTERS ARISING
9.1. There were no outstanding matters arising from previous meetings; it was noted that the action to discuss the ESA Telecommunications Building would be added to the agenda of a future meeting, when more information was available.

10. **12/13 FINANCIAL OUTTURNOFFICIAL POSITION**  **THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT:MANAGEMENT**

11. **13/14 BUDGETS**  **THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT:MANAGEMENT**

12. **CEO REPORT**  **SOME REFERENCES IN THIS SECTION HAVE BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT:MANAGEMENT/POLICY**

12.1. Council noted the contents of the science highlight report that accompanied this item.

12.2. Executive Board had approved a €12m bid for the supply of laser equipment to the Institute of Physics in the Czech Republic for the HiLASE project. There was an element of risk associated with this project but Executive Board were satisfied that the bid was prudent and incorporated headroom for potential penalties should we fail to deliver.

12.3. Further to Jane Tirard’s update that Treasury approval had been received to commit to the E-ELT project beyond the spending review, John stated that if the UK’s conditions are accepted, the UK will be one of the final countries to sign up, with the exception of Brazil. Next steps were to clearly communicate the Council conditions to ESO and to understand the split between capital and resource. John stated that nobody knew the timescale for Brazil joining the E-ELT but Council noted that the industrial quotations obtained by ESO have a limited lifetime which is a potential risk for the project.

12.4. John updated Council on his engagement with stakeholders in the period between the meeting held in November and this meeting and on forthcoming interactions in the near future.

12.5. John reminded Council of the history of the Large Facilities Steering Group which was established in CSR 2010 with membership from EPSRC, BBSRC, MRC, and Wellcome Trust; this group were given a “flat” budget (based on best available data) to recommend a funding split for ISIS, CLF, Diamond (ESRF and ILL) from within the facilities ring-fence.

12.6. All members of LFSG agreed that this was a stopgap solution at the time and that a better, more science-motivated process was required. Therefore facility science requirements were sought from the user communities but there was some concern that the LFSG had focused
primarily on the needs of their grant holders; this misses out large areas of science because grant holders are not the only users.

12.7. Facility directors were asked to provide data on costs and options i.e what could be saved if we stop doing X or Y, all of which is consistent with and linked to our own programmatic review exercise. (The Large Facilities sub-group and Science Board have been involved in this process). Since the LFFM was first developed the STFC have reassessed overhead costs and carried out a bottom up attribution using our new financial system.

12.8. Following approval by Executive Board, STFC has now delivered an “options analysis” to the LFSG based on the above. This Options analysis explores 7 options:

- Option 1 fully meets the science requirements and includes sufficient investment in the facilities to ensure that they are sustainable over a medium-term planning horizon;
- Options 2-5 explore the implications of withdrawing from supporting discrete areas of science in order to reduce costs
- Option 6 shows impact of withdrawing from ESRF and ILL
- Option 7 covers the breadth of the funding council’s science requirements but at a minimal funding level and means that the facilities are unsustainable over a medium-term

12.9. John informed Council that Executive Board had reviewed the options and can only recommend Option 1, as the others deliver marginal savings with a huge loss of capability and do not meet the science requirements. This process has been robust, defining what is needed, how to deliver it and what it will cost and has shown that STFC’s recommended option delivers the best value for money. £10m per year more is required, in the long term, than is currently allocated to the facilities “partition.”

12.10. Council noted that the recommended option, together with the options analysis document had been sent to LFSG and the next steps would be a discussion at LFSG. Council noted that the LFSG does not have the ability to solve this problem itself, as it only has a finite envelope and John stated that it was important not to apportion blame but to work together to find a solution to deal with both the short term funding gap and the longer term problem going forward. The level of resource needed is realistic and if it is not possible to find extra funding, some additional flexibility in the Drayson partitions would go a long way to solve the problem.

12.11. John envisaged that the LFSG will not be able to resolve this problem alone and that it would need to be escalated to the RCUK EG and BIS. John planned to gain agreement at this level that it is a shared problem and to work with the other Research Councils to propose a way forward.
12.12. Council were supportive of John’s approach agreeing that it was important to see the maximum return on investment in STFC facilities, commenting that Government Ministers were unlikely to want to see facilities closing down. It was also noted that the facilities are a great attractor of industry to the campuses and are internationally recognised.

12.13. Matt Griffin and Alison Davenport stated that whilst there doesn’t appear to be a clear route forward at this stage, this approach will go a long way to address the Science Board and Large Facilities Sub-Group’s concerns about the mechanism and offered Science Board’s support. John Womersley agreed to keep both Science Board and Council up to date with developments.

13. UPDATE ON CSR AND TRIENNIAL REVIEW

13.1. John fed back to Council, messages from a meeting between RCUK and Treasury officials (Conrad Smewing and Ciaran Hayes) on 17 January 2013. HMT had outlined their understanding of the budget process. It is expected that the overall envelope for financial year 15/16 would be announced, at the level of the settlement for individual departments. The total BIS budget (including the Science and Research budget) will be announced, but they do not expect any detail within that.

13.2. There will then be a process following the Budget to decide spend for 15/16 within departmental allocations. HMT expect to be involved in the BIS decisions on the Science and Research budget within that.

13.3. The starting point for decisions about the 15/16 budgets for departments is that they will continue along their present trajectory (for capital, resource and administration). This means further cuts to the BIS budget, and does not prejudge what will happen to the Science and Research budget within the BIS allocation, although the starting point would be continued flat cash.

13.4. The HMT team will be making the case centrally within HMT that, for capital, the baseline against which the 15/16 budget is set will include the additional injections of capital that have occurred over the spending review period. There is the possibility, for capital, that some indicative allocations for the period beyond 15/16 will be included.

13.5. Demonstrating efficiency and linkage to economic growth will continue to be essential. There is unlikely to be significant additional capital/resource spend announced at the Budget for the current SR period. HMT recommendation was that any bids of that type should be small, focussed, and accompanied by a very strong case linking intervention to growth.
13.6. HMT advised that our effort would be best directed towards developing larger capital/resource bids for 15/16 and beyond. These were most likely to be successful if they build further on David Willetts’ ‘8 great technologies’, rather than moving into new areas. They also stressed that in any bids, it would be important to emphasise the contribution to maximising/enhancing the impact of past investment.

13.7. Sharon Cosgrove had presented a paper to Council to update on the current understanding of the purpose and mechanics of the processes of the Triennial Review and Spending Review, the role of key players, thoughts on likely outcomes and STFC’s key messages. Council noted progress on the issues set out in the report.

13.8. Sharon updated Council on the latest status of the Triennial Review which was now underway. We have been asked for evidence to be provided through RCUK in answer to a number of questions i.e. how we give grants, our top 10 stakeholders.

13.9. Mike Sterling and John Womersley had both been sent a letter inviting them to attend a personal meeting with Ceri Smith. The letter also invited Councils to prepare a submission as to how we work in the system, how we work and anything else we think might be helpful.

13.10. Sharon Cosgrove went on to inform Council that the Triennial Review Team were going to be organising some stakeholder discussions (they have asked for a list of the next layer down of our stakeholders) but had not yet been informed how this will happen. Graeme thought that the Review team would be trying to break out of the inner circle of stakeholders, to reach people to whom our services are provided. PIs in universities and businesses at practitioner level and not necessarily through Vice-Chancellors or professional institutions.

14. REVIEW OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

14.1. Martin Barstow reported back to Council on the outcome of the review commissioned by Council of STFC’s public engagement (PE) work following a suggestion by Science Board. The review had focused principally on the formal PE Programme funded at £1.6m per annum and commissioned from STFC Programmes Directorate, but took account of all the PE work being carried out by communications staff, national laboratories staff and partner organisations such as Diamond, CERN and ESO. Martin summarised the findings that were set out in more detail in his paper to Council.

14.2. Overall the STFC PE team is well regarded across the community, but the Review Board considered that the facilities are not being fully exploited (this includes others Research Councils) and manager’s engagement skills in laboratories and facilities need developing further. PE support
needs strengthening in the National Laboratories; it was noted that the RAL team are a little understaffed so are not gaining maximum impact from facilities.

14.3. Overall engagement links with the community have been reduced. It is understood that there are not so many town meetings or events due to costs and lack of resources but this is not having a positive impact.

14.4. Martin reaffirmed his opinion expressed previously to Council that he thinks that PE is so important within STFC that the PE Advisory Panel should report directly into Council with the Chair being a Council member; this group, like other science advisory panels, currently reports into Science Board.

14.5. The Review Board recommended that an external evaluator be employed to work alongside the outreach team perhaps part time concentrating on specific areas and that more resource, if available, would make a significant difference to the Large Awards and PE Fellowships programmes' impact (no difference on small awards).

14.6. The Review Board considered that STFC should engage with the UK Citizen Science framework which is an emerging area with quite wide policy implications. It was recommended that we should look at it through RCUK.

14.7. The Review Board had commented that the RCUK programme has different priorities from STFC’s programme. John Womersley, as the RCUK PE Champion commented that what STFC does is classed as outreach and aligns well with the BIS Science and Society agenda i.e. attracting young people to science. STFC has a dedicated budget to this area of work and anyone can bid for STFC award as long as they have a research partner. RCUK’s approach is very different and they usually expect the PIs on projects to do PE for no extra money as part of their research work. Council noted that PIs can bid on grants for outreach funding but they rarely receive any; in reality PIs rarely do this as they know that there is not the funding available.

14.8. Council welcomed the paper and the work of the review board and agreed to provide further comment to Martin Barstow directly. The matter should come back to the next Council meeting under “matters arising” once Council members’ comments had been fed in.

Action: Council members to provide further comment on the PE Review Paper to Martin Barstow directly.

Action: Secretariat to add PE Review to “matters arising” at next meeting.
15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

15.1. There was no other business.

16. MEETING CLOSED

16.1. The meeting closed at 16.10 hrs.