ANGLIAN WATER INDEPENDENT CHALLENGE GROUP

MINUTES

Date: 24 January 2025
Time: 09:30-12:00
Location: Virtual

Present:

- Craig Bennett – Chair (M)
- Joanne Lancaster – Independent (M)
- Paul Metcalfe – MD, PJM Economics (M)
- Nathan Richardson – Waterwise/Blueprint for Water (M)
- John Vinson – CCW (M)

- Mark Thurston – Chief Executive, Anglian Water
- Brian Ebdon – Director of Strategic Planning and Performance
- Kay Featherstone – Head of Brand and Marketing
- Don Maher – Interim Director of Customer Wholesale Services
- Darren Rice – Regulation Director, Anglian Water
- Lottie Williams – PR24 Customer Insight Lead

- Vicky Anning – Secretariat (O)

Apologies:

- Peter Holt – Chief Executive, Uttlesford District Council (M)
- Felicity Miller – EA (M)
- Justin Tilley – Natural England (M)

Summary of actions

Actions	Status
1. Craig to arrange meeting with Don and Darren.	Open
2. Thanks to be passed on to both Pete Holland and Gill Holmes for their contributions to the ICG.	Open
3. Mark to share more details with ICG about Safer Every Day campaign following launch on 11 March.	Ongoing
4. Darren to provide further updates on Gate 3 reservoir process/funding implications.	Open
5. Kay to circulate note around customer engagement.	Open
6. Craig to arrange meeting with Mark and Ros, as well as agreeing dates for attending AW Board meeting(s) in 2025.	Open
7. Brian to circulate performance slide deck.	Open
8. Existing ICG members to confirm intentions regarding ongoing membership.	Ongoing
9. Kay to make recommendations regarding recruitment and induction of ICG members as well as recommending behaviour change experts.	Open
10. Craig and Vicky to circulate letter to National Audit Office drafted on behalf of ICG.	Closed
11. AW to share regular updates with ICG in 2025 about reservoirs, strategic pipeline (SPA), Project Nexus progress, Pollution Incident Reduction Plan.	Ongoing
12. John Vinson, CCW, to bring customer complaint review to future meeting(s).	Open
13. AW/ICG to agree new plans for site visit in 2025.	Open

Meeting minutes

Item		Action
1.	<u>**Welcome from ICG Chair**</u> **Craig Bennett**, Chair of the Independent Challenge Group (ICG), welcomed participants to the virtual meeting. Several Anglian Water colleagues introduced themselves to ICG members and explained their roles within the company: **Brian Ebdon** – Director of Strategic Planning and Performance; also looks after change and transformation teams, data and digital teams and business planning. **Kay Featherstone** – Heads up AW's Brand & Marketing team, which includes customer comms, behaviour change, insight performance etc. She was working with Lottie Williams on a proposal to potentially bring the ICG and Customer Board under the remit of her team.	

Item		Action
	Don Maher – Interim Director of Customer Wholesale Services (replacing Pete Holland, who has decided to move into the environmental sector). Don has been with AW since 2011 and was looking forward to working with the ICG. **Actions:** **Craig** suggested organising a meeting between Don, Darren and himself as the ICG moves into a new phase. **Craig** asked AW colleagues to send warm regards and thanks to Pete for all his help and involvement with the ICG. **Craig** reported on an event run jointly by Ofwat and CCW looking at the future of customer challenge groups and customer panels. There would be more discussion about this later in the meeting but he felt that the direction of travel was positive. It seemed clear that companies would be required to have independent challenge groups during the next AMP. He felt the ICG's own draft TORs were ahead of the sector's thinking and were heading in the right direction. He felt it was a good time to think about the next phase for the ICG, including recruiting new members. More discussion was planned for this during agenda item 6. Minutes from the November ICG meeting were approved.	**Actions CB/DM/ DR** **AW**
2.	**<u>Company update including Project Nexus</u>** Anglian Water's Chief Executive **Mark Thurston** commented on two outstanding actions from the November ICG meeting: • Safer Every Day launch was due to happen on 11 March – he suggested the topic should be revisited at the March meeting. • Mark had circulated draft ICG TORs to the AW Board and would expand on this during agenda item 6. Mark went on to give a company update. Since the last ICG meeting in November, Mark and his team had been focusing on Ofwat's **Final Determination** (FD), which came out on 19 December. There had been a series of Board calls and there was a two-day Board meeting scheduled for the following week, during which a decision would be made whether to appeal to the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA). Mark acknowledged this was a big decision for the company on several fronts and the decision was currently finely balanced. This would likely consume a lot of company bandwidth over the next weeks. He reported that **Project Nexus** (as described during November's ICG meeting) was having a significant impact on performance on all fronts (including on safety, WINEP obligations, water security and supply/demand index). Performance had also improved on the water recycling side, although there was still work to be done	

Item		Action
	on pollution incidents but there was confidence about improvements in performance. Mark reported that there was a lot of work to do on AW's **reservoir programme** in Q1 – with a Gate 3 submission to Ofwat due at the end of March. AW was also gearing up for intense activity on the **strategic pipeline** in 2025, with pipe laying due to start in the spring, weather permitting. **Questions:** **Nathan Richardson** asked whether Project Nexus was an internally facing programme or would the re-prioritisation of work be communicated to customers? **Mark** responded that it was designed as an internally focused programme but it was nevertheless having a positive impact on customer satisfaction (CMEX) scores because it was focusing on the things that were important to customers (AW had moved up a place from sixth to fifth).	
3.	**<u>PR24 Final Determination update</u>** **AW Regulation Director Darren Rice** gave an update on headline issues related to the Final Determination, starting with some industry headlines and how AW fits into the overall picture. He said there was a clear emphasis on investment at a sector level, with a huge sector-wide investment programme to improve the environment of £104bn over the next five years – a big step change across the sector. To give some AW context, AW's proposed investment in the previous AMP was £7bn last AMP and this time it's £11bn. There was also a step change in consumer bills to meet those demands. Bill changes of average +36% (minus inflation) across the industry. **Darren** reported that Ofwat had changed some of their positions between Draft Determination and Final Determinations (e.g. on the ODI framework), relaxing some of their positions. He felt that Ofwat had recognised the level of performance was not where Ofwat thought it would be across the sector. There was therefore a true up mechanism reflecting actual company performance to make sure there wasn't a cliff edge between business periods. **John Vinson** asked what this might do to a company's drive for performance? It might put a different emphasis on challenge and how much effort companies want to put into achieving these. **Darren** acknowledged that this did have the potential to influence incentives. On balance, the point at which it might kick in is such a subjective condition that he	

Item		Action
	believed companies would continue to prioritise improving performance for customer and environment. **Darren** reported there was a range of Totex gaps across the sector of +5% to -17%. **AW was at -2%, representing a £209m headline gap between the amount requested and the amount allowed by Ofwat.** Relative to last price review, this gap was much smaller. Gap at PR19 was 15% (which was highest Totex gap of any company, which was problematic). However, there was consensus across the sector that Ofwat hadn't gone far enough in terms of cost of capital. In terms of acceptability and investability of plans, this was weighing on company's minds. **Darren** thought that, if the DDs had become FDs, most companies would have gone to CMA redetermination. But the gaps had been closed and the range of potential CMA appellants was smaller than at DD stage. **AW headlines** **Darren** went into AW headlines in more detail. He was pleased that Ofwat had recognised the quality of AW's plan with a £13m reward. However, AW faced a significant penalty exposure, mostly driven by water recycling measures. AW was anticipating £220m penalty exposure in totality on current forecasts. 75% of that exposure related to serious and total pollution incidents. **Discussion** **Joanne Lancaster** asked whether AW was confident that Project Nexus was achieving what it needed to do. In terms of mitigating risks, where would AW look to make up any shortfall from penalties? **Darren** acknowledged AW would face pressures in regard to penalties, but the greatest penalty exposure would be faced at the start of the AMP with the exposure reducing over the AMP. There was a lag of two years in terms of funds out of the door and a true up mechanism so the company would find a way to cover the costs. **John Vinson** from CCW pointed out the industry was seeing the biggest single year increase in water bills since privatisation. CCW was concerned about affordability and pushing people into water poverty and was asking companies for more support for vulnerable customers. **Darren** responded that AW retained the capacity to support all customers at risk of water poverty. He reassured ICG members that support for vulnerable customers would not be affected by any realignment of company priorities.	

Item		Action
	Paul Metcalfe asked whether the FD, as it stands, gives a greater incentive for improving performance on pollutions? How did AW feel that current incentives compared against the actual cost of delivering improvements in performance and how did that impact on incentives? **Brian Ebdon** responded that the proof was in the pudding. The business plan was over-incentivising water recycling to get outcomes needed to accelerate performance in that area. However, even with that acceleration, AW would not be able to get down to target in the next AMP. AW would be spending more than they were protecting in terms of penalties, which he said was definitely the right thing to do for customers and the environment. **Paul** asked whether performance levels were due to historic underspend or something else? **Brian** responded that it was a mixture of many things. AW was trying to balance risks in other areas of the business and it was a constant balancing act to get water recycling to the right level, with a deteriorating asset base. **Craig** pointed out that the public expectation would be that penalties would come out of company profits/dividends rather than customer bills/investments in infrastructure. He suggested it would be worth AW reflecting on that in future narratives. **Darren** said that customers wouldn't pay for the services they did not receive but acknowledged that the point related to optics was well made. **Base cost and enhancement allowances** **Darren** went on to talk about base cost allowances, which have increased 11% during this AMP to nearly £6bn. Expectations of activity on mains renewal are all in that pot. On enhancement allowances, headline was that AW had a marginal allowance that's greater than the DD allowance, which is testament to quantum scale and depth of evidence and benchmarking that AW put into its underlying investments. **John Vinson** asked whether there was an expectation to deliver more schemes over the period? **Darren** suggested that the only area of flexibility related to storm overflow programme, which had been signposted by regulators as a multi-AMP programme. **Brian** added that AW's business plan (yet to be signed off by Board) had allocated funds to the phosphorus scheme. More money would come out of maintenance budget rather than company coffers. **Darren** went on to talk about development of two **reservoirs** in the region to secure long-term water resources in the region. Initial development costs had continued to evolve northwards quite significantly. Following constructive	

Item		Action
	conversations with Defra and Ofwat, AW had received full allowances in DD to proceed in AMP8 developing these reservoirs. There had been extensive dialogues with Ofwat, EA and Defra in relation to the **strategic pipeline**. They had agreed a revised final delivery period of March 2028, which was a three-year extension to timetable signed off by EA. AW was looking at aligning environmental obligations accordingly. In terms of costs, these were still in flight. AW had full exposure for those. **Paul** asked whether any of the funding was subject to progress at the Gate 3 process Mark had mentioned. **Darren** responded that the Gate 3 process was about ensuring milestones and he would revert with a more detailed response to this question. **Company comparison** **Darren** then talked about Ofwat's quality assessment of company plans. Three out of four companies deemed inadequate at DD level had moved upwards at FD stage. Thames Water remained inadequate. Companies with the largest exposures to base and enhancement gaps were potentially those most likely to seek CMA redetermination. AW faced a 29% gap. **Jo** asked whether some companies might settle for tactic of just being acceptable rather than going for gold medals? Balance between cost and tactics. **Darren** responded that there was no bandwidth to rest on laurels across the sector or target average performances. **John** felt that some companies might aim to be middle of the pack (e.g. for customer satisfaction measures). Although the strategy to deliberately try and be average was risky because there was no guarantee about how other companies would perform. **Nathan** asked how much scrutiny there was that money gets spent on agreed priorities rather than shuffling money around to address targets that have larger penalties? **Darren** responded that Ofwat was scaling up rigour of scrutiny in this area in AMP8. There was an expectation of six monthly updates on deliverability of capital programmes and order of assurance processes. However, he felt that moving money within the organisation to mitigate risk was acceptable, as long as it was done proportionately and not to the detriment of other things such as delivery of statutory programmes or water delivery obligations. **On enhancement**, AW had largely received the funding requested (for water supply side options, reservoirs, partial uplift on leakage etc). Significant parts of the programme were driven by investment in storm overflows, nutrient programme and growth at water recycling centres. Scale of those programmes as	 **Action DR**

Item		Action
	well as expenditure had increased. Scale of activity has also increased reflecting lived experience of technical requirements, with £280m investment to do proscribed investment at specific sites **Jo** asked about the "no allowance for Colchester sludge capacity" referred to in the slide deck and what that meant in terms of operational risk? **Brian** responded that the company was looking at whether that could be self-funded over the AMP. **FD approach to risk** **Darren** reported that Ofwat had recognised and tried to reflect a few more forward-looking risks in PR24. In terms of **cost sharing**, Ofwat had provided greater protection in recognition of complexity of process, which he regarded as significant. For example, there's been a recognition of protecting against energy price volatility. There was also an uncertainly mechanism for storm overflows, which was helpful. In terms of **PFAS**, there was some schemes in AMP8 reflected in company costs but this was unlikely to be a static position in next five years. If further investment was needed, there was now a means for investment. There were contingency options in place to allow for **strategic resource options** (SROs) such as desalination plants, which would keep options open for developing Water Resource Management Plan. **Next steps** In terms of next steps, the Board would need to make their decision around the CMA redetermination by the statutory deadline of 18 February. **Discussion** **Craig** thanked Darren for this presentation and acknowledged it was worth noting that this felt like different place to where we were at FD last time. It was a finely balanced decision that the Board needed to make. **Paul** said he was surprised that AW was considering going to CMA as it didn't seem obvious from the numbers. He felt that Ofwat had been quite generous in moving closer to a number of areas set out in the DD. He asked what would swing the company's decision? **Darren** responded that where Ofwat had set the cost of capital did not correlate to the latest evidence, which made it difficult for company's boards. He felt that the CMA would most likely reach a different conclusion based on inherent weaknesses of how Ofwat have reached their conclusions and that AW would have grounds for a targeted appeal on this measure. However, he reflected that the water sector	

Item		Action
	has a redetermination regime rather than an appeal so CMA would look at the business plan in the round rather than specific areas. Other factors affecting the company's decision included the calibration of the ODI package. AW can accept material downside risk on pollutions because they fundamentally need to improve and recognise need for upward performance. On leakage, it's a more difficult because AW is at the front end on this but still face a penalty exposure. There was a live question about calibration in the round. While headline numbers seemed rosy, calibration gave food for thought on managing risks. These were weighing into the Board's decision. The most pertinent risk was around surety of enhancement allowances. Darren felt that the FD was currently not sufficient based on top down risks and allowances. The question was whether AW could make this work and whether the CMA might reach a different conclusion to the economic regulator. **Brian** acknowledged that the company faced significant activity added to based that was unfunded to the tune of hundreds of millions of pounds. Looking at the business plan in the round, it was definitely not rosy. It was very tight to do the basics. **Craig** asked whether there was a risk, when going to the CMA, that a company could get a less favourable outcome? **Darren** responded that this was possible. A redetermination looked at everything the company's plans in the round. It would be a significant decision and a big undertaking to embark on a CMA redetermination.	
4.	**<u>Performance update</u>** **Brian Ebdon** – Director of Strategic Planning and Performance – gave an update on AW's performance based on the latest slide deck that was about to be presented to the Board the following week. **Water recycling** Brian reported that performance on **water recycling** was looking positive. Since the beginning of Project Nexus at the end of August, AW had reduced expected penalties across ODIs on water recycling by £10m – a significant improvement of 20% in projected year end positions. There had been a good end of year performance for both **internal and external flooding**. This was as a result of pulling people from across from different areas of the business to push further and faster in this area. However, AW was still in penalty for year end on these measures.	

Item		Action
	Pollutions were still not where AW wanted them to be and the company was working hard on trying to improve performance as quickly as possible. **Treatment work compliance** had seen a good end to the year performance with the highest AMP performance at 99.28%. AW received an EPA amber score in this area after a lot of activity, which was a result of pulling together hypersquads bringing a lot of focus to at-risk sites. AW was now building that activity into business as usual activity. It was a busy December for **WINEP**, with 436 obligations completed. So far response from EA has been positive to these. There were 140 obligations left to fulfil by April, which AW was confident they would achieve. **Bathing water** performance remained steady. **Questions** **Jo** said it looked like a positive end of year performance across the board. What was the price of this additional activity? **Brian** responded that Project Nexus didn't have a huge additional budget. The activity had been resourced by resequencing of activity, including pausing and redirecting some work (e.g. data-driven activity) to prioritise near-term activity. This had provided a jolt of energy and momentum to the company, with colleagues going over and above to improve performance. Brian described Project Nexus as a sprint rather than a marathon, which wasn't sustainable over the long term. Some people needed to return to day jobs. **Jo** asked whether AW was confident that the foundations were in place for positive outcomes across all these sets of indicators without that extra energy and focus from Project Nexus? **Brian** explained that AW had carried out a benefits mapping activity whereby the company can prioritise activity across multiple ODIs to build up a detailed plan for what AMP8 needs to look like to deliver performance outcomes. The push from Project Nexus would help AW to get on right footing for AMP8. At end of Basecamp 1, Nexus would fade into existing plans for AMP8/build into BAU. **Nathan** asked about impact of weather on performance planning? **Brian** said that AW builds weather scenarios into business planning, based on previous patterns. **Water** **Brian** reported good performance on water for most of the year. Two areas were off track: - Water quality compliance - Abstraction incentive mechanism	

Item		Action
	Supply interruptions were recurrently at 4 minutes in December but were likely to rise to 8 minutes to year end due to freeze-thaws during January to March. **Leakage** was an ongoing challenge – AW continues to drive as hard as possible on this metric but it was tough. The company was right at the edge of what they could do with a lot of effort to keep the numbers steady. **Water quality contacts** was moving in the wrong direction this month. This was due to a slightly different mix of water after planned outages, but AW was still within target set for the year. **Questions** **John** asked about the tariff trial AW is piloting and the communications around that in terms of behaviour change/saving water/leakage. **Brian** said that, in terms of leakage, AW was UK-leading if not world-leading. The company was playing their part and needed others to do the same. Water meter roll out was having an impact here. **Kay** acknowledged it was a fine balance to talk about the company's leakage position with customers. The company was carrying out a lot of education work around managing water and leakage identification innovations. There had been positive engagement with customers around tariffs and smart meters and was ongoing work on bespoke comms around behaviour change. **Customer** **Brian** reported that it had been good year in terms of customer measures, with increases in AW's position for **CMex (6th) and DMex (5th)**. **Don** added that CMex was likely to go to 5th place. From DMex perspective, Q3 has been strongest in several years – things were moving in the right direction and AW would be ahead of target on DMex. **Brian** reported that AW was smashing targets in terms of managing **void properties**. In terms of **per capita consumption (PCC**), PCC had been tracking well over the period. Ofwat had now agreed to give Covid relief, which would be helpful. Delivery of **smart meters** was still going well. AW was marginally behind on install target but hoping to complete installation by end of AMP. AW was anticipating £2.7m reward across the customer metrics. The company was expecting around £35m in penalties from year five. **Questions** **John** asked whether AW would be in reward or deadband on PCC?	

Item		Action
	Brian said AW was waiting to hear on that - they may be in marginal reward on PCC. **John** asked about preparation for BRMex coming in. **Don** reminded ICG members that AW put forward a bespoke performance commitment for business customers on retail satisfaction in AMP7 to track retail satisfaction. AW has been carrying out its own insight survey on this. This had put them in a good position to be able to drive BRMex going forward. **Environmental Performance Assessment** Quite a lot of the key measures of EPA were focus of Project Nexus. In terms of **serious pollutions**, AW was likely to finish on final figure of ten over the year. The company was working hard to get this figure down. AW had an overall **2* EPA rating forecast** – this is not where the company wanted to be, but overall delivery was much higher than was anticipated six months ago. Hoping to get 3* next year (very solid 2*). Any pollution incident is an instant 2* rating. The challenge for next AMP is maintaining serious pollutions at zero. **Self reporting** was at 85 % and continues to climb; will finish in green. Brian was happy with performance on **treatment work compliance**. A lot of effort had gone into that. **WINEP** would finish amber over year. **Supply and demand balance index (STV**I) was also one of the focus areas for Project Nexus. This looks at whether there is enough water in all of the catchment areas. One of the biggest challenges was water supply that flows between companies. This challenge had now been met and the measure would be in amber perhaps green by end of tax year. **Sludge disposal and abstraction** was expected to land in green. **Questions** **John** asked about sludge disposal plans and how these would be communicated. **Brian** acknowledged sludge to land disposal was a tricky issue and a difficult conversation with customers. It was a live discussion and AW had been a key contributor to the debate. He pointed out that the alternative to sludge to land disposal was incineration, which he felt would not be good for customers or environment.	

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Item</th><th>Action</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Craig thanked Brian for the presentation and said it was encouraging to see the impact Project Nexus was having on performance, which was moving in the right direction.

Craig asked for a copy of Brian's slide deck to be circulated to ICG members. ICG were keen to see these on a regular basis to understand and scrutinise customer performance.

Action: Brian was requested to circulate slides (with caveats around sensitive information/confidentiality.)</td><td>Action: BE</td></tr>
<tr><td>5.</td><td><u>Customer engagement and behaviour change update</u>

Slides had been circulated to ICG members in advance. Due to time pressures, it was decided that Kay Featherstone would send around an explanatory note to accompany the slides.

Action: Kay Featherstone to circulate note regarding customer engagement.</td><td>Action KF</td></tr>
<tr><td>6.</td><td><u>ICG composition and future agenda/meetings</u>

Craig had shared slides from recent Ofwat/CCW meeting about the role of customer challenge. AW's TORs were heading in the right direction.
It was clear that ministers recognised the need for independent challenge groups and customer panels at a sector level. He felt that ICGs should work alongside customer panels, helping to give them a voice at a Board level.

Mark had circulated ICG TORs to AW Board and agreed that there was an appetite from the government level for customer groups to hold a mirror to water companies. He was in favour of not reinventing the wheel but tailoring what the company already had in place (ICG and Customer Board). The Chair of AW's Board also agreed with this approach.

Next steps would be for Mark and the Chair of the Board to meet Craig and work out practicalities. He suggested that Craig might have a 30/40 minute slot to present ICG discussion at a Board level.

John said that CCW's stance was supportive of current proposals to help understand and build up a better picture of customer views. It was not a given that CCW would be coordinating this work but it was looking likely (pending an Ofwat consultation).

Lottie Williams reported that she had met with Jenny Sugate from CCW to talk about the role of customer panels. It was an exciting time to make the most of different channels for customer engagement.</td><td>Action MT/CB</td></tr>
</table>

Item		Action
	Darren was happy with ICGs draft TORs and felt that the role of the group was dovetailing well with emerging expectations both in terms of scrutiny of AW but also having touch points into wider policy debates, which is important and powerful. There was then discussion about the composition of the ICG, with agreement that there was more representation needed around affordability/vulnerable customers. Other areas discussed was the need for local authority representation and also for expertise in customer engagement/behaviour change. There was also discussion around the need to keep the ICG structure as streamlined as possible, without the need for lots of members and subpanels, but also to make sure that members were committed and able to attend meeting regularly. **Craig** asked for clarification from existing ICG members whether they were willing to commit to the being active and engaged ICG members during the next price review. Vicky noted the following: - **Gillian Holmes** had retired from the ICG; Craig offered his warm thanks for her valuable contribution to the ICG. - **Justin Tilley** from Natural England had indicated that he was not able to regularly attend ICG meeting but would read materials and pass relevant issues on to Natural England colleagues. - **Victoria Williams** from the Environment Agency had stood down from the ICG and EA would be represented in future by **Felicity Miller**. There was discussion around the process for identifying and recruiting new members, as well as drawing on pool of external expertise from across the business, and developing a robust induction process for ICG members. **Action**: Kay to consider induction pack and process for recruiting as well as interaction between ICG and customer board. **Action**: Kay to recommend some suitable behaviour change experts.	**Action ICG members** **Action KF** **Action KF**
7.	**<u>AOB</u>** **Craig** reported that the **National Audit Office** was carrying out a review of water industry regulation and spoke to chairs of ICG, which they then asked to follow up with written evidence. In particular, they were interested in where Ofwat hadn't responded to areas where there was strong customer evidence. Vicky and Craig had drafted a letter to the NAO based on previous CEF/ICG reports. **Action:** VA to circulate letter to ICG members. **Craig** raised the issue of forever chemicals, which had attracted media attention and was emerging on the sector agenda, particularly in the AW region.	**Action VA**

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Item</th><th>Action</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Don invited ICG members to attend a growth conference scheduled for the following week in Peterborough.

Proposed 2025 dates (currently two weeks before AW Board meetings):

• Thursday, 13 March 9.30-noon (virtual)
• Friday, 23 May 9.30-4.30 (face to face)
• Friday, 11 July am (TBC)
• Tuesday, 16 September 9.30-noon (virtual)
• Thursday, 6 November 9.30-4.30 (face to face)</td><td></td></tr>
</table>