

# Minutes of 79th UK Chemical Stakeholder Forum meeting, 24th June 2020, Virtual Conference

## 1. Welcome by Chair

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting (see Annex A for attendance & apologies).

### 1.1. Agenda

The Chair explained that, the meeting was virtual due to the current circumstances of the Coronavirus pandemic (Covid-19) and much shorter than it would have been face-to-face. Therefore, the agenda had been focussed to a few select topics. The Chair of the meeting was drawn from the Steering group on a rotating basis and that the meeting was held under Chatham House rule.

### 1.2. Approval of draft minutes of the 78th UKCSF meeting (UKCSF/20/02)

The draft minutes of the January meeting were approved.

## 2. Update on the response to Covid-19

An official, of the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS), gave a verbal update on the government response to the Covid-19 pandemic.

They reported that conversations had been ongoing with industry. Companies had been able to continue production on the whole, although often at lower levels and switching production in some cases e.g., manufacturing PPE equipment. The general consensus was that industry had coped well throughout this difficult period.

They said that there were ongoing financial discussions. BASF had received the largest loan under CLBILS and the chemicals sector had also made use of the furlough scheme, but had not always chosen to take financial support from government. Workplace guidance was well received and as a heavily-regulated sector the chemicals sector was comfortable implementing such regulations. The 14-day quarantine for people arriving in the country had been introduced recently and BEIS had established exceptions e.g. for workers entering the country to carry out specialist repairs to production equipment.

They reported that issues with production of hand sanitisers had been resolved and the focus was now moving from an exclusive focus on Covid-19, to post- Covid-19 recovery and the end of the Transition Period. Discussions were ongoing surrounding

decarbonisation, sustainability, ongoing production of hand sanitizer, etc. Several projects developed as part of the Sector Deal proposal were being considered for support including a battery recycling centre and the manufacture of bio-ethylene oxide.

An official, of the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (Defra), presented on “Green Recovery”. See Annex B.

She explained that there was a huge impact from Covid-19 and economic fallout was expected. Transformational action was required to promote green economic growth post-pandemic and asked how a circular economy could build future resilience. Forum attendees were encouraged to consider a green recovery when building back up from Covid-19. Defra would be happy to hear ideas from attendees on green recovery. These could be sent to the Secretariat.

## 2.1. Q&A

An attendee raised the point that Covid-19 had affected the chemicals sector at a time when communication was particularly needed within the industry, particularly at a European level. The attendee was in support of a green recovery and investment towards it. They said that what would be helpful to all industries is the Office for National Statistics (ONS) project for a “National Materials Data hub”, which would map the flow of all materials through the UK economy, enabling increased understanding and identification of UK strengths and weaknesses. BEIS responded that they agreed that there was now an opportunity to invest more in sustainability and that he was engaged in discussions on the ONS “National Materials Data hub”, reporting that a recent circular economy event had put data at the centre of the discussion.

Another attendee suggested the UK should learn lessons from the EU’s work on the SCIP database as they thought the data requirements would add to the cost of recycling. They suggested that policy options were needed to encourage the use of recycled materials until supply chains are established, e.g., feed in tariffs for solar panels, which enabled the industry to reach a level of cost-effectiveness better than coal. Defra responded that it was still considering its options in this area and were not currently planning to duplicate the system in the UK. It was noted that if businesses were trading in the EU market, they would have to produce these data.

A third attendee pointed out that demand was an aspect which hadn’t been mentioned as part of the recovery. Much of the sector had been severely affected and there was uncertainty if demand from certain downstream sectors would return to previous levels any time soon. They suggested that the Forum discuss how innovations might help prevent future outbreaks of Covid-19. Some were looking at anti-viral coatings and what role these could play in the future. BEIS responded with agreement that there were challenges with reviving demand, particularly in downstream sectors. They continued that innovation is part of the critical national infrastructure and important for resilience.

## 2.2. Updates from CSF members

A representative of the Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC) reported that in initial phases, members were asking to help. The RSC signposted them to channels where they could volunteer resources and expertise. General frustration was expressed around a lack of coordination on this from government. The RSC shared insights via the House of Commons S&T Committee inquiry on UK research capability. The Higher Education sector asked for more guidance on how to re-start labs and practical teaching. The RSC encouraged industry to share best practises. Longer-term impacts were expected on university-business collaborations and on research strategy and priorities, with concerns for primary focus on health at the cost of other areas. The RSC shared these insights with UKRI and BEIS. Impacts were expected on the R&D / chemistry workforce. In response to immediate impacts on PhDs, postdocs and technical staff on short-term contracts, the RSC opened up financial support via the Chemist's Community Fund to non-members. Long term impacts could include financial implications (and potentially closures) for chemistry departments. Interruptions to teaching and learning at all stages of education may impact progression and employment. The RSC has provided support for teaching/learning from home and conveyed impacts to relevant stakeholders.

Another representative of the RSC, reported that their Industry Team had been engaging with R&D intensive chemical sciences based SMEs. This sector representative group of 400 companies had significant potential to solve UK and global societal challenges such as the green recovery, as well as contributing huge financial growth to UK PLC. Covid-19 meant these companies had to shift from long to short term planning and in some cases change their core business model in order to survive. Where an SME was co-located within a shared University space, access to laboratories and essential specialist equipment wasn't possible due to the closure of Universities, this was a major issue. Despite this, there were numerous success stories, for example 3D printing of PPE using new technology. This chemistry community had showcased their ability to be agile and adaptive in very difficult times resulting in no redundancies to date. Funding, either via government or private investment, is critical to R&D innovation but Covid-19 had caused a drop in confidence from investors. To realise the growth potential of this advanced knowledge and innovation, a support structure was needed which would ultimately bring about a substantial return on investment to the UK economy.

A representative of Trades Union Congress – (Unite), reported that, most member queries have been about how to deal with Covid-19, e.g., risk assessments. More recently, queries are related to returning to office work. In the last 24 hours, Unite have been working on the “1 metre +” guidance from the UK government. One of the problems they are having is that this guidance only refers to England, whereas they also have members in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, where the guidance is different. The guidance emphasizes maintaining 2 metres distance where possible. This is the Unite policy and industry has

already invested a lot in this. For the chemical sector, Unite have worked a lot with CIA and engaged with government, including BEIS. They participated in a consultation on sector guidance however, were not consulted on the review of the 2 metre guidance. Unite have set up a Covid-19 website, which has health & safety, employment and legal information. There is a huge number of closures and redundancies that they are working to oppose or delay, on the basis that there will be a recovery and when that comes there will be a need to employ people safely.

A representative of Make UK, reported that their main issue had been with the Job Retention Scheme (JRS). It was set for three weeks at a time which was problematic when trying to meet fluctuating demand. The manufacturing sector is composed of more than 70% of SMEs who struggled immediately, so quick access to finance was critical. Larger companies didn't have immediate major problems but, said they would in 6 to 9 months and some have already announced redundancies. Make UK worked closely with the government and the "Big Five" on the JRS and access to finance. The new JRS scheme provided more flexibility which helped with shifts. Another challenge was around credit insurers reducing or withdrawing their credit terms, leaving companies stranded, especially SMEs. The supply chain had interruptions and there had been problems with storage, e.g. materials being stored in ships at sea or container shortages, this had returned to normal. Digitalisation had been helpful for resilience because, production could be controlled at a distance. Circular economy had played a positive role, as some companies had been able to repurpose, remanufacture and utilise materials that were at hand in the UK. Companies were willing to invest but, it was difficult for them so they needed support. Make UK were preparing for more redundancies when the JRS closes.

A representative of Cruelty Free International (CFI), reported that the Covid-19 pandemic had directly affected animals. The scale of the impact on animal testing was unknown however, in the race for a vaccine and appropriate treatments animal experiments had increased. There were no appropriate animal models of Covid-19 and historically there had been limited successful vaccines, despite apparently promising results in animals. There was no approved vaccine for recent outbreaks, including SARS or Zika and overall, 90% of drugs fail in clinical trials. Vaccines currently in clinical trials had avoided some superfluous animal tests and CFI hoped that one positive outcome of the pandemic was that companies and governments would consider reducing animal testing. CFI worked alongside other animal protection groups in raising awareness of the impact that Covid-19 research has had on animals in labs, by writing to the World Health Organization asking for greater coordination of research efforts to prevent duplication of animal tests. CFI also joined 100 experts in signing an open letter, calling for prioritising non-animal research, to help the discovery of an effective vaccine and treatments for Covid-19. CFI had also asked questions of the government regarding, the care of animals in labs given social distancing measures.

A representative of the Chemical Industries Association (CIA), reported that operations continued throughout the pandemic and they worked to government advice. This included carrying out risk assessments, identifying critical activities and key or vulnerable workers. Office workers continued to work from home and companies had adapted well to changes in working practices, with good wellbeing support provided for all workers. As part of mental health awareness week in May, CIA made their members' interactive mental health tool freely available, for any business to use on their website. CIA continued to hold member calls, share experiences and signpost key information. They sought clarification where needed on the interpretation of guidance, e.g., essential workers and furloughing. CIA worked with government, regulators and trade unions on concerns such as, hand sanitisers, waste and general site operations. There had been challenges with PPE supplies, some reports of fake respirators and more recently, potential implications with test and trace. In addition to, bringing back contractors and workers to sites, needing to train them on new measures and new working systems. CIA hoped to see order books pick up and return to business as usual. The chemicals sector had fared relatively well but, there may be a lag seen later in the year.

A representative of the UK Cleaning Products Industry Association (UKCPI), reported that its members active in consumer products had experienced increased sales as cleaning behaviours in the home had changed, whether this is sustained remained to be seen. However, for members active in the professional cleaning sector, those whose products are used in hospitality, suffered lower sales during the early shut down period but those active in supplying the healthcare sector (NHS and care homes) were holding up well. There had been challenges with shortages of raw materials such as ethanol as well as in packaging. Sourcing additional supplies was well managed with support from the HSE and good communication from BEIS. However, as much of the excess ethanol came from distillers, as they switch back to supplying the pub and restaurant trade that opportunity would now disappear. Lessons needed to be learnt to ensure future supply chain resilience should there be a second wave and increased demand of disinfectants and sanitisers. On the downside, there had been an increase of 'entrepreneurs / opportunists' entering the cleaning chemicals market, often with no regulatory knowledge, and no discipline on their use of microbial efficacy claims. This could be misleading to consumers and / or businesses purchasing their technologies.

A representative of the British Coatings Federation (BCF), reported that they also had winners and losers amongst their members. Manufacturers of house paints and wood-stains did well, as people were doing DIY during lockdown. Those making printing inks for food packaging did well because of huge demand for food in supermarkets. However, industrial coatings were down 35% in April & May, professional decorative coatings for construction and home improvements were also down, 50% in April & 20% in May.

Newspaper production had dropped by 70%, which impacted ink manufacturers, and this pandemic had brought forward the decline in printed newspapers by 4 years. BCF made several representations to government ensuring that the coatings industry would stay open, as their members provide many essential products which had been used throughout the pandemic. Government support, especially the furlough scheme, was welcome. BCF held an interesting seminar with the RSC Coatings group with over 150 people, discussing anti-viral coatings. Officials from the NHS and TFL talked about how this could help keep surfaces cleaner for longer and potentially reduce the spread of the virus. However, products need efficacy testing (level 3) and fast track approvals through the Biocidal Products Regulation.

A representative of the Environmental Service Association (ESA), reported that early on, ESA set up a Covid-19 committee of 20 members with weekly meetings and created a risk register to identify issues. The risk register had been a useful tool throughout and provided focus. The “Waste Industry Safety Health (WISH) Forum”, had produced regularly updated health & safety guidance throughout. Initial issues were around securing recognition of the sector as a critical industry and getting some degree of prioritisation for PPE supply for standard and Covid-19 related work. There were concerns on keeping waste collection services running, but fortunately unrealised. ESA sought for flexibility for permitting and planning requirements and got a positive response from regulators. The EA provided flexibility through regulatory position statements. ESA had a positive and constructive experience working with government departments and agencies, such as the weekly Defra Covid-19 meetings. The main success had been keeping the basic services going. Testing was secured for the sector and exemptions from quarantine requirements for travel in and out of the UK. Flexibility around driver hours and MOT testing were important. Going forward, ESA were looking towards green recovery and assurances around track and trace.

A representative of the British Association for Chemicals Specialities (BACS), reported that their main activity during Covid-19 was associated with hand sanitisers as many BACS members manufacture cleaning products and disinfectants. There was high demand from the NHS and others so, BACS worked actively with BEIS, the HSE and HMRC for derogations from the normal procedures for the authorisation of hand sanitisers, to facilitate manufacture in the face of shortages of products and raw materials. BACS also worked with BEIS to ensure that those who work in the manufacturing process were included in the definition of key workers.

A representative of the Chartered Institution of Wastes Management (CIWM), reported that they had a good relationship with UK governments during Covid-19, with helpful weekly calls and regular engagement. CIWM inputted into contingency planning and development of COVID-19 guidance and policy measures for the sector, as well as helping with getting

requests for data out to the sector and messages about changes to regulatory positions and policies. Some frontline work that the sector did was critical and it proved resilient. The sector maintained all its core services, despite there being moments of uncertainty as to what the impact could have been. The sector was also agile, quickly developing health & safety guidance and risk assessments. Some supply chains which were relied on for recycling and circular economy were vulnerable. This was already known but, Covid-19 reemphasised the issue. Most relevant to the chemicals sector was Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) recycling. The feedstocks dried up and the sector struggled to withstand the shock. To push forward with circular economy, it must be ensured that the domestic processing and infrastructure is stronger.

A representative of the Non-Ferrous Alliance (NFA), reported that Covid-19 had inhibited the timings of needed discussions and had reduced activity for some companies. On the positive side, there was a note from the University of York, dating back to 2013, on the beneficial effects of having copper surfaces, for example, handrails and door handles. This note would be forwarded to the Secretariat for circulation, as it may be helpful to consider, for the way the sector would need to continue changing, as Covid-19 potentially stays with us for the next few years.

### **2.3. Q&A**

One attendee raised a point to UKCPA that communications about when to use specific products need to be very clear. They were concerned to see increased messaging around using expensive cleaning products and bringing more chemicals into the home.

A question was asked to CFI on whether it is possible to obtain monthly figures on animal usage or if there were only annual reports. CFI responded that, data is reported annually, typically around June. However, a date had not yet been announced.

## **3. Update on EU Exit policy for Chemicals**

A Defra official, provided a verbal update on EU Exit policy for Chemicals.

They reminded the Forum that while the UK is in the transition period, EU regulations continue to apply. The transition period would end on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020, as confirmed by the Prime Minister. Defra continued to prepare for an independent regulatory regime, UK REACH.

They continued that the work Defra had been doing over the last 2-3 years, particularly for a “no-deal” scenario, means the UK is ready for 1st January 2021 and the establishment of an independent regulatory framework for chemicals UK REACH. This reflects the current government’s red lines and desire for regulatory autonomy. In making the transition to UK REACH, the key principles of EU REACH would be retained.

The official explained that, there are three key building blocks of UK REACH preparations. The first is legislative, statutory instruments (SIs) that would come into force on 1<sup>st</sup> January. The second is the REACH IT System, which was being developed and enhanced over coming months. This includes a third “Model Office” exercise, likely to take place in October, enabling testing of the IT system to ensure it is fit for purpose. Thirdly, the building of capability and capacity within the HSE and EA. Defra continued to work closely with colleagues and preparations were very much as cross-departmental project, with BEIS playing a key part as well.

There was a reminder of the current transitional measures, relating to timescales for the provision of the necessary information to confirm registrations under UK REACH. In response to concerns from stakeholders, around the associated timescales and costs for accessing this data, Defra carried out focussed evidence gathering sessions with a number of stakeholders and were considering the conclusions from those discussions.

A key point that had attracted interest, are the plans to have decision making in place for authorisations and restrictions. The UK would not be replicating the EU exactly but, are carrying over key principles such as, transparency and the use of technical advice. In terms of mitigating costs to businesses, this is dependent on what the UK is able to negotiate with EU.

The official said that the UK is looking to negotiate a data sharing mechanism. The government had published details of its plans in February and May, which are available on the “gov.uk” website. There had been four rounds of negotiations to date with both sides recognising the need to speed up these discussions. On the Northern Ireland Protocol (NIP), it was noted that a command paper was released on May 20<sup>th</sup>. Further guidance for more regulated goods, including chemicals, will follow.

They concluded the update by saying that, the previous detailed guidance was being reviewed and updated, it would be published as soon as possible. Defra remained open to further stakeholder engagement over the coming months.

### 3.1. Q&A

A question was asked about the mechanisms for scientific advice that the HSE was putting in place. Defra responded that work was underway to put this in place, retaining the key principles of ensuring independence of advice, and engagement with a wider community.

Another attendee said that given the economic and environmental logic of retaining close alignment to EU REACH, then the current approach for an independent UK REACH needed a rethink, as it weakens UK effectiveness and reduces the strength of UK market.

A question was asked on whether public health bodies in the UK, would retain their current role under UK REACH. Confirmation that this would be the case would follow in writing.

In response to a question on what was being done to ensure there is no duplication of animal testing, Defra said that animal testing could only be done as a last resort. This was



one of the protected principles being carried over EU REACH. The UK had always been at the forefront of opposing unnecessary animal testing and would continue to do so.

The final question asked if Northern Ireland, as a result of the NIP, would be required to continue following EU Occupational Exposure Limits, thereby implementing batches 2 and 3 of the EU's Carcinogens and Mutagens Directive, following the end of the transition period, or if Northern Ireland would be able to establish its own Workplace Exposure Limits and keep levels in tandem with the HSE. Defra's understanding was that Northern Ireland would continue to be subject to EU regulations but, would confirm this in writing.

## 4. Update on the Chemicals Strategy

The Joint Head of Chemicals and Pesticides at Defra, presented on the "Chemicals Strategy". See Annex C.

They reminded the Forum that the Chemicals Strategy had been temporarily paused to free up staff for Covid-19 response work. They reaffirmed that this is only a pause and work on the strategy would pick up again, as resource would be back from July. They reiterated the importance of a green recovery and encouraged the Forum to input further thoughts or comments, ahead of the strategy's "Call for Evidence", to the Secretariat.

### 4.1. Q&A

An attendee asked when the "Call for Evidence" would be. Defra responded that this would be the next milestone with the chemicals strategy but, timing could not yet be confirmed.

A comment was raised that, following the impact of Covid-19, the new Chemicals Strategy should be sensitive to the economic recovery challenges and promote safe use through the risk and science-based policy environment, recognising innovation has an essential role. Defra responded that pre- Covid-19, they were looking at how the structure of the strategy would be broken down, with innovation and scientific evidence being at the core. The strategy would focus long-term on the way forward for the global chemicals industry.

A question asked was to what extent there had been an overlap with the Chemicals Strategy and the parallel Resource and Waste Strategy, and if there had been any thought into the interface between these to drive the circularity element. Defra responded that yes, the chemicals-product-waste-interface CSF sub-group was looking at this and thoughts could be fed in through the Secretariat.

The final question asked was if the Chemicals Strategy would become a standing item on the CSF agenda, and how input and feedback can be obtained from the Devolved Administrations (DAs). Defra responded that they would discuss having the strategy as a standing agenda item with the Steering Group and that they have regular catch-ups with representatives in the DAs, to gain their input and ensure that the strategy represents a UK view.

## 5. River basin planning: Challenges and Choices consultation

Environment Agency (EA) officials, presented on the “River basin planning: Challenges and Choices consultation”. See Annex D.

The consultation is on the challenges facing water environment and the aspiration of what is needed to return 75% of waters to their natural state. The closing date is 24 September 2020 and any queries could be sent to the Secretariat. Participants were encouraged to complete the [Challenges and Choices consultation](#).

## 6. AOB

An attendee raised that the policy update paper, which is circulated prior to the meeting, should be presented as an agenda item for discussion. The Chair made a note of this to take away to the Steering Group.

Another attendee asked that as the policy update paper contains a summary of what is taking place with EU REACH, would the paper still be circulated after the transition period. The Secretariat responded that yes it would and content would be updated as appropriate. Comments on the format and what would make the paper more useful were welcomed.

### 6.1. Next meeting

The Chair closed the meeting and thanked everyone for attending. The next meeting would be held on 1 October 2020, whether this is held virtually or face-to-face would depend on government guidance.

## Annexes

Annex A: Attendance and apologies

Annex B: Presentation – Green Recovery

Annex C: Presentation – Chemicals Strategy

Annex D: Presentation – River basin planning: Challenges and Choices consultation

For accessibility reasons, Annexes B, C, and D will not be made available on the UKCSF website. Copies can be obtained by contacting the Secretariat at [Chemicals@defra.gov.uk](mailto:Chemicals@defra.gov.uk).

## Annex A: Attendance and apologies

### Attendees

Clara Ritch	3M
Simon Field	3M
Tony Bingham	AGB Chemical Compliance
Helen Lynn	Alliance for Cancer Prevention
Helen Kean	Anthesis (UK) Limited
Tom Bowtell	British Coatings Federation
Elisabeth Laird	Beryllium Science & Technology Association
Joshua Kelly	Biffa Waste Services
John Reid	British Association for Chemical Specialities
David Park	British Coatings Federation
Mohamed Elkhalfa	British Plastics Federation
David Bolton	British Retail Consortium
Jamie Page	Cancer Prevention & Education Society
Tim Burrows	Charles River Early Discovery
Pat Jennings	Chartered Institution of Wastes Management
Anna Watson	CHEM Trust
Michael Cooper	Chemical Business Association
Luke Buxton	Chemical Watch
Roger Pullin	Chemical Industries Association
Lara Dickens	Chemservice UK
Joanna Sacks	CLEAPSS
Caroline Rainsford	Cosmetics Toiletries and Perfumery Association
Khurram Jowiya	Cruelty Free International
Richard Ayton	Dow
Rohit Mistry	Economics for the Environment Consultancy Ltd

Gareth Simkins	ENDS Report
Gene Wilson	Environmental Services Association / Augean plc
Steve Hollins	Exponent International
Libby Peake	Green Alliance
Melissa Wang	Greenpeace
David Santillo	Greenpeace Research Laboratories
Phil Rowley	Independent
Nigel Haigh	Institute for European Environmental Policy
Tracey Donaldson	Institute of Chemical Engineers
Rachel Stonehouse	Institute of Materials Minerals and Mining
Lisa Hipgrave	International Fragrance Association UK
Brigitte Amoruso	Make UK
Francesca Bevan	Marine Conservation Society
Sean Kelly	Nanotechnology Industries Association
Wieslaw Piatkiewicz	Non Ferrous Alliance
Ian Axford	Office of the Government Chemist
Iain de Grey	Parex Ltd
Samantha Saunders	PETA International Science Consortium Ltd
Gilly Stoddart	PETA International Science Consortium Ltd
Sue Bullock	Ramboll UK Ltd
Rebecca Johansen	Ricardo Energy & Environment
David Carlander	Risk & Policy Analysts Ltd
David Lever	Risk & Policy Analysts Ltd
Thomas Persich	Risk & Policy Analysts Ltd
Andrew Waterworth	Royal Society of Chemistry
Camilla Alexander-White	Royal Society of Chemistry
Karen Stroobants	Royal Society of Chemistry
David Bott	Society of Chemical Industry
Craig Melson	techuk

Bud Hudspith	Trades Union Congress – Unite
Natasha Gerard	UK Aerospace, Defence, Security and Space industries / BAE Systems
Steve George	UK Aerospace, Defence, Security and Space industries / Rolls-Royce plc
Philip Malpass	UK Cleaning Products Industry Association
Andrew Roberts	UK Petroleum Industry Association
Philip Malpass	UK Cleaning Products Industry Association
Eleanor Grimes	UL
Nick Bennett	University of Nottingham
Cecily Spelling	Wildlife and Countryside Link
Barnaby Coupe	Wildlife Trusts
Victoria Cherrier	Wood plc
Liz Nicol	Wood plc

## Apologies

Sean McPike	Eli Lilly
David Wright	UK Lubricants Association
James Clark	University of York

**Government officials**

Lee Vousden	BEIS	Janet Sheridan	DAERA
Alison Elliott	Defra	Colette Gilkes	Defra
Georgia Heritage	Defra	Gershinder Rai	Defra
Helen Ainsworth	Defra	Jane Morrill	Defra
John Wiggins	Defra	Katie Dick	Defra
Kay Williams	Defra	Max Folkett	Defra
Robert Jones	Defra	Ruth Michael	Defra
Simon Johnson	Defra	Steve Morris	Defra
Tabitha Tossell	Defra	Vanessa Sanderson	Defra
Susie Willows	Defra	Joanne Cooper	EA
Lorraine Hutt	EA	Suzanne Bennett	EA
Pippa Curtis-Jackson	EA	Tom Nickson	EA
Kate Sharpe	Home Office	Stavros Georgiou	HSE
Martin McVay	Welsh Government		