

Technology Strategy Board

Driving Innovation

Governing Board Meeting

Minutes of the 39th Meeting

The meeting was held on 26 & 27th March 2013 at the Satellite Applications Catapult, Harwell and the Milton Hill House Hotel.

Attendance

Board:

David Grant (Chair)
Mike Carr
Stewart Davies
Iain Gray
Andrew Milligan
Hazel Moore
Sara Murray
Colin Paynter
Doug Richard
Ian Shott
Chris Snowden
Bob Sorrell

Apologies:

Phil Smith
Jonathan Kestenbaum
Allyson Reed
Mark Glover

Executive:

David Bott
Simon Edmonds
Graham Hutchins
Guy Rickett
David Way

BIS:

John Dodds

By Invitation (27th only):

Rob Saunders – Head of Energy
Alan Moore – ORE Catapult Board
Andrew Jamieson CEO ORE Catapult
David Currie – ORE Catapult
Tim Just – Head of Space
Tim Sherwood – Chair Sat App Catapult
Stuart Martin – CEO Sat App Catapult
Clare Parsons – WIG observer

Day One

Welcomes

1. The Chair welcomed the Board to the 39th meeting. He conveyed apologies from Phil Smith, Jonathan Kestenbaum, Allyson Reed and Mark Glover.
2. The Chair reminded the Board of the main items of business for the meeting: Engagement Strategy, finance, the approval of the delivery plan and business plans for two catapults.

Minutes of the 38th meeting (paper: TSB2013-01-09)

3. The Board **approved** the minutes of the 38th meeting. The following matters were raised:
 - a. Paragraph 11: The table setting out the distribution of Technology Strategy Board funding should be developed further to map all distributed resources

and physical assets, including Catapults. This could stimulate a debate about whether there was a need for remedial action (**action**).

- b. Paragraph 9: There remained a need for a more systematic process for developing spending review submissions that included Board input to priority setting (**action**). Iain Gray reported that the team was still working on this and that there was a lot of interaction with BIS at the moment on the current submission.
- c. Paragraph 27: The action to articulate the weakness of the ETI membership model remained open.

Chief Executive's report (paper: TSB2013-02-02)

4. **Budget 2013**: Iain Gray reported that the recent Budget had contained some important issues for the Technology Strategy Board that also overlapped with the issues raised in the Government response to the report of the Heseltine Review. He highlighted that there had been clear recognition of the need for a national innovation agenda.
5. After a good deal of work promoting SBRI, Government had accepted that it had a role as lead customer for innovation and the Budget speech announced a 5-fold increase in SBRI engagement to £100m/y by 13/14 and to £200m/y by 2014/15. The main initial areas would be defence and health, but Transport, DECC, Defra and Home office were also to be involved. They were tasked with delivering the increased spend from departmental procurement budgets. It will be a significant task within the Technology Strategy Board to implement, making SBRI one of its biggest activities, for which the necessary effort was not yet in place. A resourcing plan was being put together. While this was still a small part of total procurement budgets for departments and there remained a need to help ministers to understand that this should not be seen as R&D but procurement, there would be some pushback and inertia in departments. The challenges in working with departments were to identify where SBRI will work well, persuade departments to engage and then finally to buy the products. In discussion it was noted that the Technology Strategy Board had moved from being sellers to buyers with the departments so this should encourage engagement but efforts should be made to maintain quality as volume increases.
6. A significant sum had been allocated in the Budget for an Aerospace Technology Institute (ATI). It remained unclear what this would be or what role the Technology Strategy Board would play. The Technology Strategy Board had not been as deeply engaged in the discussion as would have been ideal but was encouraging the Government to implement the Institute using existing tools (including CR&D, innovation platforms and Catapults). The industrial players would be meeting soon to develop an implementation plan. This institute was viewed by industry as being more virtual than a Catapult. John Dodds remarked that a large programme of directed R&D was seen to be needed for the UK position in aerospace to be maintained and a lot of the capability rested with the Technology Strategy Board, in for example, the High Value manufacturing Catapult and collaborative R&D competitions. The Government wanted a partnership with the private sector in developing roadmaps etc, with the research councils and universities, which played to Technology Strategy Board expertise and capability. In discussing the ATI, the following points were made:
 - a. Efforts should be made to present this institute as a Technology Strategy Board initiative and avoid having solutions imposed externally.

- b. The Technology Strategy Board must embrace the ATI agenda and deliver it, not allow something else to emerge.
 - c. Downside defensive positioning should be mirrored by proactive positioning. A public paper should be put out, embracing the proposed institute, offering the full weight and expertise of the Technology Strategy Board to deliver sector benefit.
 - d. The Technology Strategy Board should get deeply into the discussions and shape them rather than become an instrument for delegated implementation. It has a seat on the Aerospace Leadership Council and a good track record in the aerodynamics centre.
 - e. There remained a need to do some research through a small team and write a position paper. The Technology Strategy Board has the competence, capability and experience but needs to build the capacity and show leadership (**action**).
7. Iain Gray reported that the Budget also included £15M for a Technology Strategy Board competition on visual effects for the creative film industry to be run in partnership with DCMS. This will be a single grand-challenge competition. The news had been well received in the community.
8. In discussing the Budget, the following comments were made:
- a. While the SBRI changes had been a clear win for the Technology Strategy Board, the visual effects and ATI programmes had been led by others. This should be a concern in that the Technology Strategy Board should, as a high priority, position itself at the forefront of thinking and influencing. The processes through which cases for new programmes and bids to government are created and the Board's involvement in developing and promoting those cases needed further discussion.
 - b. The Strategy Board did not fail on the quality of business cases but on reputation and trust. It should be a priority to do something as a Board to become trusted advisors and not become merely an implementation tool, in the current role of delivery agent for proposals from industry forums.
 - c. John Dodds reminded the Board that Spending Review bids needed to be in close to final shape by mid April and commented that the Technology Strategy Board cases could be made stronger if they had been less conceptual and more specific. For example, a big bid for a demonstrator in a defined area would have been better received than a bid for "some demonstrators". But he took the view that this had been a good budget for the Technology Strategy Board and for innovation. The R&D tax credit increase for big firms also helped. He cautioned though that the economy wasn't getting any better and Government retained deficit reduction as its prime goal. Treasury was seeking £11.5b departmental cuts and was expecting to protect NHS and overseas development. BIS will need to find £1.5b in 2015/16. Ministers still saw innovation as worth protecting.
9. In discussing the remainder of his report, Iain Gray highlighted the following:
- a. There had been good progress in hiring key teams in the Catapults.
 - b. The SME support pilot had revealed some issues with data but had developed some excellent SME engagement.
 - c. A new communications strategy and organisation were being developed. Building the Technology Strategy Board reputation across government would

be a key aspect of this. There was a huge seam of success stories to tap into. BIS was expecting the Technology Strategy Board to raise the bar here.

- d. Whilst there had been some organisational issues in delivering InnovateUK 2013, the event appeared to go well with some >4,500 visits.
 - e. A lot of work had been done to develop the new operational dashboard and a one-page summary will also be developed. Feedback on the content from Board members to Mark Glover was sought (**action**). The Board noted that output measures were handled separately from the operational dashboard including a range of tool evaluations, programme evaluations and a Companies House study. These will go towards the building of an economic impact report which will describe the impact of the various programmes on jobs and economic growth.
10. Andrew Milligan reported on the recent Audit Committee. He confirmed that the NAO and Internal Audit had been broadly happy with the accounts and each had work schedules. All was reported to be on course for the accounts to be laid this summer. The Committee had also looked in more detail at the risk register and carried out internal effectiveness review which had raised some fine tuning issues. He undertook to provide an annual report to the next Board meeting (**action**) and expressed his thanks to John Brown and Nick Buckland who had finally stood down as members.

Finance (Paper: TSB2013-02-05)

11. Graham Hutchins presented the paper. He described the year end situation reporting the expected £49M underspend against the original budget but, with 2 budget revisions, this variance had been brought down to £4.5m. BIS had returned funds to Treasury at Treasury's request in order to deliver reduced 2012/14 public borrowing. He explained that the main causes of the underspend had been the BIS allocation of Biomedical Catalyst and Future Cities Demonstrator funding on unrealistic timescales, an issue that had been raised with BIS at the time. In discussion, the following points were made:
- a. Audit committee had looked at some possible areas for managed over-commitments to counter future underspend issues.
 - b. Graham Hutchins was looking into why spending on Smart grants was typically much slower than expected
 - c. The current picture was evidence of a systemic problem with spend forecasting. Whilst the excel modelling was sophisticated, the ability to analyse and check the outcome was difficult. A formal processing and analysis tool was needed to do this better. This was an urgent issue that needs to be addressed. Graham Hutchins was looking into procuring a proprietary tool to help with this.
 - d. The new tool should help with forecasting and scenario planning but this was not a complex model and there should by now have been sufficient experience within the current and past portfolio to enable accurate prediction so it was hard to understand why there is such a forecasting failure.
12. The Board agreed that a goal should be set to get this forecasting right within appropriate variance and within a specified timeframe (**action**).
13. The Board agreed to use some of its members' expertise and their contacts to help to solve the problem (**action**).

14. The Board asked Iain Gray to work with John Dodds and BIS to reduce the use of narrowly-drawn ring fences which made good financial management very difficult (**action**).

Delivery Plan (Paper TSB2013-02-04)

15. Iain Gray presented the paper and reminded the Board that the team, Mark Glover in particular, had spoken to the Board collectively and individually about the Delivery Plan over the preceding months. He drew attention to the summary actions and reminded the Board that a few modifications remained necessary to reflect the Budget changes. John Dodds commented that the Plan should do more to acknowledge the industrial strategy and also the others in the landscape, especially the “eight great technologies” and the research councils. Iain Gray reported that this document would be supplemented with other communications that were focussed on a range of audiences. The Board agreed to focus its discussion on issues of affordability and financial planning
16. Graham Hutchins described the financial impact of the programmes proposed in the Plan. He explained that the current activity, as planned, would result in significant overspends in the next two financial years, if the plans came true. He described the actions that he planned to take (implementing realistic timelines, re-visiting the amounts committed and reviewing the in-year spend) to ensure that spend in 2013/14 and 2014/15 would be within budget. He resolved to develop a revised financial plan and seek off-line approval from the Phil Smith, David Grant and Andrew Milligan within two weeks. The Board **agreed**.
17. John Dodds welcomed this way forward and remarked that BIS could not support a plan which included a planned overspend.
18. The Board reiterated that there was need to understand better the relationship between level of commitment on grants and the subsequent impact on future spend and whether a specific level of over commitment should be planned.

Engagement Strategy (Paper TSB2013-02-03)

19. David Way presented the paper. He explained that the paper was intended to show how the Board’s engagement activities could be more effective than in the past. A key strategic goal was to speed up the movement of business from concept to commercialisation. In discussion the following comments were made:
 - a. The relationship with the KTNs is not going to be radically changed. They will remain free-standing and ultimately accountable to the Technology Strategy Board. Sometimes they are also contracted to deliver specific tasks. In their general work, they must continue to challenge and be objective. The KTNs are an integral part of the overall engagement strategy.
 - b. The paper mentions that consistent branding and messaging would be necessary but did not include any brand values or messages. It will be impossible to ask the various parts to sing from a common song sheet until the song sheet has some content. It makes no sense investing in new communications channels until the messages are agreed. There are plenty of experts on this who could help develop the key messages very quickly. David Bott reported that he was running an exercise to find ways to encapsulate what the Technology Strategy Board does simply and that this would be delivered in the next month or so (**action**).

- c. The KTNs were getting concerned about whether they will exist in a year's time and will find it difficult to plan for the future until this issue is sorted out.
- d. There was a big gap in England where the RDAs had been the key outreach mechanism for local support. However, it was hard to see what such a new team could deliver until there was a clearer picture of that they would do. It was also difficult to understand whether a team of 9 was the right order of magnitude.
- e. While the paper was a good description of the vision and challenges, it did not include the actions planned to address these so its use as a strategy was limited. It was necessary to look to the basic principles of marketing: who are we trying to reach and what do we want them to hear? There was a central problem with Technology Strategy Board data that meant that it was very difficult to know who we had ever dealt with. This needed correcting urgently so that the known digital channels could be used. BIS was also weak in this area.

Tour of the Satellite Applications Catapult and dinner

- 20. The meeting adjourned. The Board was joined by Rt Hon David Willetts MP, Minister of State in BIS, for a tour of the Satellite Applications Catapult and a formal dinner discussion. Issues discussed over dinner included:
 - a. The great potential demonstrated by the businesses included in the Satellite Applications Catapult tour
 - b. Identifying options for future capital bids
 - c. The need for a consistent long-term national energy policy
 - d. Getting more external investment to innovative SMEs
 - e. The highly beneficial tax-relief terms of the Seed EIS for angel investors
 - f. How the Technology Strategy Board should become better engaged in the international agenda
 - g. Improving communications of impact and success stories
 - h. Engaging departments in the upgraded SBRI programme

Day two

- 21. The Chair welcomed Clare Parsons of the Whitehall and Industry Group (WIG) who was attending the meeting as an observer for development reasons. He explained that Clare was helping the Technology Strategy Board in its recruitment of the Catapult teams. He gave apologies from Chris Snowden who could not attend the second day.
- 22. John Dodds drew the Board's attention to the new Government announcement on nuclear strategy which made a number of references to the Technology Strategy Board and the High Value Manufacturing Catapult, both of which had been involved in the development of the strategy.

Engagement Strategy (continued)

- 23. The Board continued its discussion of the Engagement Strategy paper. the following comments were made:

- a. There are some examples of best practice in KTNs which have delivered outstanding results from working together, forming Special Interest Groups and new sector strategies and implementation plans, delivering measurable impact on jobs and growth and delivered new government investment. The Technology Strategy Board is driving industrial strategy through these routes.
 - b. The chairs of the KTNs feel remote from the Technology Strategy Board and want to get closer.
 - c. More work is required to deliver some hard economic impact metrics for engagement/KTN activities.
 - d. There is a danger of overcomplicating this engagement strategy. The Executive team does not have any marketing expertise. There is a need to get target community intelligence into a proper CRM and start using it for marketing. The Board should demand that this happen in the next few months and, as a matter of urgency, appoint someone who does this for a living. The KTNs could be described as a group of unruly distributors. It was not necessary to dictate how they operate but assemble them and get them to work together against agreed targets. Someone should own this function and be tasked with developing a marketing plan (**agreed - action**).
 - e. There remained a need for a sub-national strategy, especially in the context of the Heseltine agenda for delivery through Local Enterprise Partnerships. The Technology Strategy Board was not leveraging all the business it could and sub-national networks may help us reach them. GAIN in the South-West (Plymouth) was an interesting model to look at.
24. The Board agreed that more work was necessary to turn the current strategy paper into a planned activity. It remarked that this needed an identified person to lead it (**action**).

Satellite Applications Catapult (Paper TSB2013-02-07)

25. The Chair reminded the Board that the two Catapults whose business plans were being considered at this meeting had each already been approved in principle by the Board and that it was their budgets that now needed approval. These had come to the Board because the amounts concerned were above the £10M executive approval limit. They would also need approval from BIS and Treasury.
26. Colin Paynter formally declared an interest in the Satellite Applications Catapult because Astrium had some connections with it. The Chairman agreed that, should the Board's private discussions touch upon issues of material interest to Astrium, Colin Paynter would withdraw from the discussion.
27. The teams representing the Satellite Applications Catapult and the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult joined the meeting.
28. Tim Sherwood, Chair of the Satellite Applications Catapult Board, introduced the topic. He reported that most members of the senior team and non-executive board were now in place and many of the governance structures were formed. SME engagement had already started and several engagement workshops had been run across the country.
29. Stuart Martin, CEO of the Satellite Applications Catapult presented the main elements of the Catapult's business plan. In response to questions he added the following:

- a. The early revenues were difficult to predict and so targets had been conservative. If these were not achieved then targets and other KPIs will be reviewed. Simon Edmonds reported that performance, including revenue, would be monitored by the Catapult's Board and that all the Catapults would be monitored by the oversight Committee. The Technology Strategy Board will also get regular reports of performance, including co-funding, and any necessary management corrections. Annual review points were included in the 5-year contracts.
 - b. There remained a range of risk issues that needed more detail. The staff risk had been mitigated by a highly collaborative approach with secondments cycling through from industry and academe. Recruitment costs had been kept low through use of LinkedIn but had managed to attract a good number of excellent candidates.
 - c. Economic impact multiplier estimates are based on observed past experiences and those previously used in the Space IGT case. The Board requested the previous Space IGT case (**action**)
 - d. The consultation process had heard from businesses in the sensor development area where internal investment decisions had been held up by in-orbit demonstration.
 - e. The case showed two "valleys of death" (commercialisation and exploitation failures) but the entrepreneurial journey is likely to encounter other valleys of death.
30. In discussion the following comments were made:
- a. There is an apparent disconnect between the £100M predicted output and the £40b market share in 2030. A better description was required of the additionality of the Catapult over and above the natural market growth.
 - b. At the moment, the best estimates of the economic return from this Catapult suggested a that a much higher level of ambition was required

Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult (Paper TSB2013-02-06)

31. Alan Moore, a member of the Non-Executive Board of the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult introduced the topic and gave an update on the developing membership of the Board. He was very pleased with the appointment of Andrew Jamieson as CEO. He reported that it had taken somewhat longer than had been hoped to reach this point with a full business plan to consider.
32. Andrew Jamieson introduced himself and presented the paper. He reminded the Board that politics had a large role to play in the energy sector. In discussion the following points were raised:
 - a. The challenge for this Catapult is unique. The technology needs to be very de-risked to get industry buy-in. The Catapult still needed to earn a reputation in this.
 - b. This was a very conservative industry and leadership will be critical. It was not yet clear that the industry wished to be led or where early adoption would come from. The industry tends to prefer preformed packages. If it sees such a package it will buy in.
 - c. There was a need to be aware that the growth timescales are very long and the cost is higher before financial return can be expected, some 5 years out.

- d. A major risk remained that Government policy changes could lead to a greater emphasis on nuclear and fracking and reduced commitment to renewables. This policy risk will always be present but nuclear was becoming more economically challenging and UK fracking was politically difficult and capacity poorly understood.
- e. The UK and the world market are going to need more of all energy types so this market is real. The UK has some of the best wind resource in Europe.
- f. Offshore is the opposite of onshore for costs – the main issues being below the sea surface and extracting power to the grid. The main opportunities were real but the subsea issues remained very challenging.
- g. The Business Plan offered a good vision for the industry but did not illustrate well the specific Catapult activity. Much of this will be data analysis. The big demonstrator activity will need to be the subject of separate capital bids.
- h. The Catapult programme had been the subject of detailed discussions with DECC and Scottish energy officials – it was very well connected in government.
- i. It remained unclear which UK businesses would deliver the increased UK market share in this sector. Oil & gas and shipbuilding sectors were expected to make a major contribution to the below-surface part of the market.

Closed session to discuss proposed Catapult business plans

- 33. The Catapult teams withdrew from the meeting
- 34. Simon Edmunds described the processes that the Executive had gone through to satisfy itself that there were strong and viable business plans for each of these Catapults.
 - a. For Satellite Applications, he was confident that a strong business plan had been produced. This had the approval of the Catapult's board and all players were happy. The Technology Strategy Board management team was also happy and confident.
 - b. For the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult, very close scrutiny of the challenge and rationale had been undertaken. This had been developed and sharpened. While the satellite applications activity had largely been driven by the sector, the whole offshore renewable energy programme had been driven by the Catapult team, primarily by Andrew Jamieson and the board. The Catapult's Board was now happy with proposal. The Technology Strategy Board management team had now also reviewed it twice.
- 35. The Chair expressed confidence in the Catapult teams. He commented that the quality of the people considerably de-risked the proposed investment. He suggested that it should be a priority to keep the teams together and maintain pressure on them to deliver, seeking regular feedback through dipstick testing. He invited comments from the Board:
 - a. The Satellite Applications Catapult was responding to a clear market pull and so the investment was for acceleration. Success in offshore renewable energy required a significant demand creation activity on the part of the Catapult and will require more patience and closer observation.
 - b. The Satellite Applications Catapult lacked demonstrated ambition and needed to be held to the task of making an impact on growth and UK market share and communicating this well.

- c. The Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult strategy of engagement needed to be stronger. A sector champion was needed, such as the role played by Richard Parry-Jones in the Automotive Council, but the Green Industries Council was not as influential. While the Catapult team was strong it would find it difficult to lead the industry without a strong, whole energy industry council that looks across the whole sector.
 - d. The Technology Strategy Board should develop the competency of measuring and reporting economic impact and use that to help the Catapults. Warwick University was currently delivering a programme in this area for all the Catapults. The Satellite Applications Catapult used Oxford Economic Forecasting to develop its economic impact forecasts. Mark Glover was putting together a team to build a standard for forecasting economic impact across Technology Strategy Board programmes.
 - e. There was also a need for some metrics on expectations on the teams and operational costs.
 - f. It was not yet clear how the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult was expecting to make a difference. It needed a very early review point to look at where it adds value. This was weak at the moment because the GVA-delivering sectors were poorly represented.
36. John Dodds reported that he had concerns over the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult's need to push the market and the industry. He saw a requirement to ensure that the formulation of an offshore energy strategy would be driven by more than the catapult. There was better cooperation between BIS and DECC now. NAREC was possibly a very useful facility but had its own problems.
 37. Iain Gray agreed that the £150m capital required for a significant offshore demonstrator was a strong candidate in the Chancellor's capital opportunity.
 38. Iain Gray re-emphasised that there were two very different challenges: for the Satellite Applications catapult to raise the bar around ambition whilst the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult had to recognise the inherent risk associated with Government Energy Policy, and needed a stronger strategy for business engagement.
 39. The Chair proposed that the Board approve the business plans and recommend their funding to BIS and Treasury. He reiterated the need to reflect back to the teams the concerns that Iain Gray had emphasised. Both Business plans were **approved**.
 40. Iain Gray agreed that the executive would confirm the details of the Board's concerns with the Chair and feed these back to the catapult teams with a clear action to report progress early and regularly to the oversight Committee through Simon Edmonds (**action**).

AOB

41. The Board discussed the position it reached in the previous day's finance discussion and the need for clarification that there was a clear pathway to getting confidence on forecasting going forward. Hazel Moore agreed to discuss this further with Graham Hutchins (**action**).
42. The Board discussed the need to develop a marketing strategy and bring in someone new to lead this. Doug Richard offered to help with this. Iain Gray and David Bott agreed to come back with a plan of how they will move this forward and bring someone new into the organisation (**action**).

43. The Board agreed that there was an urgent need to develop capital expenditure ideas to feed into the Chancellor's exercise. It agreed that there was a need to do this in the context of a better strategic understanding of how the Technology Strategy Board interacts with the emerging industrial strategy and that such a discussion should be conducted at Board level. The Board agreed that such a "shopping list" should be developed through a Board sub-group. This was an opportunity too important to let pass as this was a 10 year capital programme (**action**).

Summary of decisions and actions:

No	Action	Responsibility	Target date
1	Develop a geographical map of the distribution of all Technology Strategy Board funding resources and physical assets, including Catapults [paragraph 3a] .	Mark Glover	May Board meeting
2	Develop a more systematic process for developing spending review submissions that includes Board input to priority setting [paragraph 3b] .	Iain Gray	
3	Put together a small team to write a position paper on how the Technology Strategy Board can design and deliver the ATI [paragraph 6e] .	Iain Gray	
4	Provide feedback on the content of the operational dashboard to Mark Glover [paragraph 9e] .	All Board members	
5	Set a goal to get financial forecasting right within appropriate variance in a specified timeframe [paragraph 12] .	Iain Gray	May Board meeting
6	Seek help from Board members' and their contacts to address the financial forecasting and modelling challenge [paragraph 13] .	Graham Hutchins	May
7	Work with John Dodds and BIS to reduce the use of narrowly-drawn ring fences which complicate good financial management [paragraph 14] .	Iain Gray	
8	Develop a revised financial table for the Delivery Plan and then seek off-line approval from the Chair, the current Chair and the Chair of the Audit Committee [paragraph 16] .	Graham Hutchins	10 th April
9	Report results of messaging exercise [paragraph 19b] .	David Bott	May Board meeting
10	Consult with Doug Richard and develop a marketing plan [paragraphs 23e & 42] .	David Way	
11	Develop the current engagement strategy paper into a planned activity and identify an individual to lead it [paragraphs 24 & 42] .	David Way	
12	Distribute the Space IGT case containing the economic multiplier estimates [paragraph 29c] .	Simon Edmonds	April
13	The Board approved the business plans for the Satellite Applications Catapult and the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult [paragraph 39]		
14	Confirm the Board's concerns on the Catapults with the Chair and feed these back to the catapult teams [paragraph 40]	Simon Edmonds	April
15	Discuss how to find a clear pathway to getting confidence on forecasting going forward with Hazel Moore [paragraph 41]	Graham Hutchins	
16	Develop a "shopping list" of capital expenditure ideas to feed into the Chancellor's exercise through a Board sub-group [paragraph 43]	Iain Gray	