

# Technology Strategy Board

Driving Innovation

## Governing Board Meeting

### Minutes of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Meeting

The meeting was held on 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> October 2013 at the Devonport House Hotel, London.

#### Attendance

**Board:**

Phil Smith  
Mike Carr  
Stewart Davies  
David Grant  
Iain Gray  
Andrew Milligan  
Sara Murray  
Hazel Moore  
Colin Paynter  
Doug Richard  
Ian Shott

**Apologies:**

Andrew Milligan (attending Friday only)  
Christopher Snowden  
Bob Sorrell

**BIS:**

Amanda Brooks  
Keith Hodgkinson

**Executive:**

David Bott  
Simon Edmonds  
Mark Glover  
Graham Hutchins  
Guy Rickett  
Aileen Thompson  
David Way

**For Transport Systems Catapult:**

Will Whitehorn (Chair)  
Steve Yianni (CEO)  
Andrew Everett (Head of Transport)  
Toby Hiles (Transport Team)

**For Future Cities Catapult:**

Sir David King (Chair)  
Peter Madden (CEO)  
Richard Miller (Head of Sustainability)

#### Welcomes

1. The Chair welcomed the Board to its 42<sup>nd</sup> meeting. In particular he welcomed Aileen Thompson, interim Director of Communications, Amanda Brooks, BIS Director Innovation and Keith Hodgkinson, Deputy Director to their first meeting.
2. He conveyed apologies for absence from Andrew Milligan (attending Friday only), Sir Christopher Snowden and Robert Sorrell.
3. He reminded the Board that David Grant and Andrew Milligan's terms of office had been extended by a year to July 2014.
4. The Chair reminded the Board of the main items of business for this meeting:
  - a. Future Cities and Transport Systems Catapults
  - b. Communications and branding
  - c. New dashboard

- d. Finance and forecasting
- e. The 2014 Delivery Plan

**Minutes of the 41<sup>st</sup> meeting** (paper: TSB2013-04-09)

- 5. The Board **approved** the minutes of the 41<sup>st</sup> meeting.
- 6. David Bott reported that action 9, the meeting with the Catapult and KTN boards and other advisory bodies was scheduled to take place the following Monday at the Design Museum. He reported that the Panel would include Ruth McKernon of Pfizer, Andy Hopper, Cambridge, Glen Shoosmith of Booking Bug, and Jo Roach of Makieworld. Iain Gray commented that there was an impressive group of people due to attend.

**Remuneration Committee membership** (paper: TSB2013-05-09)

- 7. The Board **approved** the nomination of Colin Paynter to the Remuneration Committee. Amanda Brooks reminded the Board that BIS had observer status on the Remuneration Committee.

**Chief Executive's report** (paper: TSB2013-04-02)

- 8. Iain Gray introduced his report. The following issues were discussed:
  - a. **Witty review:** Ian Gray suggested that more needed to be done to engage Andrew Witty in the Technology Strategy Board agenda. The review itself had proposed a concept called "Arrow Project" to drive value from new technologies to businesses. These seem to fit well with the Technology Strategy Board's technology priorities and the 8 great technologies. He reported that the review had recommended that the Technology Strategy Board get engaged in Arrow Projects. There was a need to put together an appropriate Technology Strategy Board response to the report. Some Board members expressed concern that the Technology Strategy Board may have to support a new type of project/initiative. Amanda Brooks reported that BIS Innovation Directorate would be drawing up the BIS response. Phil Smith and Iain Gray undertook to speak to Andrew Witty in advance of the response (**action**). David Grant reported that the interim report had been well received in the universities but Arrow projects had not emerged at that stage,
  - b. The Board noted that different ministers appeared to have different emphases in respect of industrial strategy and the 8 great technologies, and recognised a danger of getting pulled in two directions.
  - c. **Senior recruitment:** The Board noted that an active recruitment programme was ongoing and agreed to reserve discussion on this topic for the closed session at the end of the meeting
  - d. **KTN Optimisation:** the Board noted progress in reorganising the management of the KTNs. David Way reminded the Board of the need for a more fluid and dynamic set of networks, better aligned with Technology Strategy Board strategic priorities. He reported on the rationale and progress of developing and implementing a new business model.
  - e. Mike Carr expressed serious dissatisfaction with the decision process that had led to consolidation of the KTNs. He commented that a number of discussions had taken place in Board meetings and he had felt reassured that the outcome

would not be centralisation and had undertaken discussions with stakeholders on that basis. He took the view that successful KTNs required an independent spirit and was concerned that any centralisation would put off the participation of the independent chairs.

- f. Iain Gray said that the intention was to preserve the spirit of the KTNs' independence through the continuation of the steering groups. He felt that the word "centralisation" misrepresented what was actually happening. The aim was to deliver flexibility and responsiveness as the KTNs had become increasingly separated from Technology Strategy Board strategic priorities.
  - g. In further discussion the following comments were made: We must be sure not to lose what we have; many members were not opposed to the changes so long as the specialist people remain; the intention must not be to reduce the cost but to deliver more; the ambition to double membership is good and gives a valid purpose to the change but this should be expected to increase costs.
  - h. The Board noted that there was a governance issue to be addressed here possibly as a result of a misunderstanding. The Chair expressed a view that there appeared to have been a Board process failure which should be examined (**action**).
  - i. Simon Edmonds gave an oral update on the funding of Narec: He reported that discussions on a merger with the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult had been taking place but these needed BIS to be clear as to whether it was able to fund it. The Narec CEO had announced his forthcoming retirement and this had removed a potential barrier to a merger. Narec was expected to require continuing subsidy for some time. The two chairs had met and agreed principles for a combined merger proposal. In discussion it was suggested that this was a big risk for the Technology Strategy Board in which there was not yet sufficient reassurance, particularly as there is still a lack of confidence in offshore renewables policy. Simon Edmonds commented that the Catapult would be greatly strengthened by such a merger but this will need to be proven. It was agreed that any merger would be reviewed at the December board should the merger have progressed that far. Simon Edmonds offered to discuss the reports from KPMG and proposals with any Board members who requested it (**action**).
9. The Board **noted** the report

### **Communications and Branding** (paper TSB2013-05-03)

10. The Chairman set the context for this item describing the challenges facing Technology Strategy Board communications based on observations from talking to stakeholders. He also asked what Technology Strategy Board branding represented and whether it needs revising. He suggested that, after extensive past discussion, it was now necessary to know what the Technology Strategy Board was and what its brand should convey. The organisation had changed significantly in size and expectations.
11. David Bott reported that an agency had advised that inconsistent messaging and visual identity was confusing; master and sub branding was imprecise.
12. Keith Hodgkinson reminded the Board that its name was set down in legislation so seeking any formal change to the name could be challenging.
13. Aileen Thompson commented that it was timely to be looking at a new communications strategy, just as the Government communications team was

strengthening its own approach to communications and branding. In discussion the following comments were made:

- a. The strategy was fine as a description of process but the next step for getting to a plan was not clear. The Board should be presented with thoughts on a plan before it starts to be implemented. Aileen Thompson agreed to bring a paper to the December 2013 meeting (**action**).
  - b. A new approach to communications, branding and marketing should be in place and operational in Q1 of the next FY.
  - c. There was a danger of over complicating this. The Technology Strategy Board will never have a large marketing budget. The priority remained to create a consistent statement about who we are and what we do. An emphasis on “writing a story” was less important than coming up with the plan to communicate the message. There would still remain a big task in raising awareness.
14. Over dinner, in informal session, the Board discussed the type of brand it should be developing. The following morning the Board reviewed those discussions and offered a number of comments to be fed into the next stage of development of the communications plan.

#### **Dashboard (paper TSB2013-05-13)**

15. Mark Glover introduced the paper. He explained that the dashboard was still work in progress but had now reached a state of maturity where it can be used and discussed at the Board. It had already driven a valuable management information discussion. Some of the data was delivered automatically, some still required manual entry. He described the dashboard. In discussion of the content the following comments were made:
- a. There was a risk associated with the need to overspend in 2014/15 in order to ramp up for the 2015/16 SR uplift.
  - b. There was an ongoing internal debate about the right risk tolerance for the RAG status regarding project status.
  - c. The data for website and \_connect performance prompted some searching questions. The mix of analytics year on year and month by month stats were unhelpful and possibly misleading. Standard Google analytics would probably be more useful.
  - d. It would be useful to measure how long it takes to fill posts and this could go into the dashboard.
  - e. It might be useful to have a chart showing the over committing needed to land the budget on target.
  - f. The proportion of live projects with red status was a low number and appeared to drop unrealistically over the period of one month. There are inconsistencies in the MO reporting. The measure should be whether the project is delivering not just about spending rate.
16. In discussing forward commitment plans the Board noted that to achieve the SR15/16 plans the Executive would have to start a ramp in 2014/15 which would extend beyond 2015/16. This meant exceeding the 2014/15 budget and probably exceeding the current nominal (pre-election) 2016/17 budget. The Board acknowledged the risk and supported the executive in progressing as proposed.

17. Sara Murray reminded the Board that the Metrics Working Group had asked whether it was possible to seek HM Treasury support in obtaining staff and revenue data on companies the Technology Strategy Board had supported and companies not supported in order to get a longer term look at the extent to which Technology Strategy Board support delivered company growth. Iain Gray reminded the Board that the Dashboard was a monthly exercise and that longer term measures of impact were being developed elsewhere. Mark Glover reported that for small young companies, Companies House data was not useful and he was looking at data from ONS. Keith Hodgkinson reminded the Board that the Spending Review settlement required the Technology Strategy Board to produce a new evaluation framework.
18. The Board agreed that it was good finally to have a consistent set of measures against which performance can be reviewed. It was noted that Dstl were facing similar issues and David Grant agreed to make the appropriate introductions to enable a useful discussion (**action**).
19. Stewart Davies commented that the new Dashboard could do a useful job of supporting both management and the Board. He felt that the number of measures could be reduced to the most sensitive areas and suggested that it was now appropriate to look at the role of the Board in reviewing the dashboard.

### **Finance and improving financial forecasting accuracy – review of associated processes**

20. Iain Gray introduced this item. He reminded the Board of the work put in over the last year on improving the data and the “over committing” used in key strategic areas to get the financial spend on target and the forecasts more accurate.
21. Graham Hutchins presented the finance paper (TSB2013-05-12) and described the current financial situation and some of the key financial planning risks. Iain Gray summarised by explaining that he would be advising BIS of an expected modest manageable overspend.
22. Amanda Brooks reported that BIS was looking through the partner bodies’ finance responses seeking to understand next year’s budget, attempting to identify where any flexibility may lie. She commented that BIS recognised that the Technology Strategy Board was taking on a very high level of additional responsibility and the financial consequences of that.
23. In discussion the following comments were made:
  - a. It was necessary to consider how the next few years looked so that it would be possible to consider what new responsibilities would be acceptable.
  - b. The charts and the report was encouraging but only mid-year. We still need to deliver on this forecast.
  - c. This report was very clear. Much better than previous presentations.
24. Graham Hutchins introduced the financial forecasting paper (TSB2013-05-04). He described the process review that had led to this paper and explained that the review had found that inaccuracies happen in all parts of the process. It had identified a range of key actions. Iain Gray explained that there remained a need to separate actions between short term confidence actions and overall effectiveness actions. The Board commended the progress made in the financial forecasting review. In discussion the following comments were made:
  - a. This had been well worth undertaking and it was certainly coming together. The findings cascade through to the numbers. But the question remains of

how to improve delivery impact. System problems in delivery and management remain and there were still questions about control, visibility, responsibility and accountability. There was potential for a perception of conflict where Graham Hutchins was responsible both for delivery and measurement.

- b. This was good work and these actions will yield improvements. But clients' processes also need looking at. Grant recipients' workshops might help.
  - c. The Board requested a comprehensive review of operations, competition design and resource use. It needs to ask whether we can deliver. This should be part of a root and branch review. We have not yet asked all the right questions, e.g. are we using the right tools and running competitions in the right way? We don't have the output metrics to look at effectiveness of tools. Iain Gray commented that much of this had been asked in the review.
  - d. Whilst the review has delivered, it was through the lens of forecasting accuracy. We need also to look through operational efficiency and impact lens. That must be phase two.
  - e. The data should be used to deliver an operational visual as well as the financial.
25. Iain Gray remarked that as the next strategic plan comes together over the coming year, it would be necessary to rebuild the Technology Strategy Board machinery to deliver that. The next activity, by March 2014, would be to look at the evaluation elements of the process framework. This would also address the question of how to organise a set of functions that will deliver (**action**).

### **Transport Systems Catapult** (paper: TSB2013-05-07)

26. The Chair welcomed the Transport Systems Catapult team to the meeting. He reminded the Board that it had approved the Catapult in principle in an earlier meeting and that the task before it now was to consider the approval of the proposed business plan, which had been scrutinised and recommended by the Executive. He further reminded the Board that funding approval would also be required in BIS and Treasury.
27. Will Whitehorn introduced the Catapult team and the proposal. He expressed concern that when he accepted the chair role, DfT advised that this was an area of market failure. This was not something he did not recognise, with the UK's extensive high quality, high safety, market delivered transport services in very busy and complex systems with rapidly increasing capacity. He saw high levels of business success, much of it unsung. He saw the Catapult as a fantastic opportunity. The demand from industry was for a breakdown of the silos of data and information and also in autonomous vehicles. Bringing the range of modes and players together was something this Catapult can achieve. He reported his view that transport suffered from institutional failure where policy makers cannot make timely decisions on airports or rail lines. But at the same time, UK ability to build transport infrastructure was excellent and demand from industry for a Catapult was enormous.
28. Steve Yianni presented the details of the business plan. He described the economic ambition as adding £1.4 bn in value. He reported that the launch was due to take place the following week with David Willetts and Philip Rutnam. In response to questions he described the major companies expected to contribute and also some of the SMEs and made the following comments:

- a. He saw a significant potential tie-up with the Fraunhofer. He did not expect to seek to lead in Europe yet but to work with other more established partners before aiming for a stronger leadership position.
  - b. While there was a lot of academic work in this space, some in the Fraunhofer, no one else was doing this multi-mode systems approach with business.
  - c. The US Department of Transportation was looking at this with interest. The OECD was also interested because they saw no one tackling the integration challenge.
  - d. The NTSM (National Transport Systems Model) will be a unique world first.
29. The Catapult team was questioned about other technology and innovation centres operating in the integrated transport space. The team agreed to go ahead and map the structures that they knew and take a wider review as to who their potential competitors or collaborators were (**action**).
30. The Catapult team withdrew.

### **Transport Systems Catapult Closed session**

31. In closed session the Board discussed the proposal further and agreed that a good case had been made. It made the following comments:
- a. There was a strong need to map the gap in the market and provide a better understanding of who else around the world was operating in this space.
  - b. The approach to focus on delivering a higher UK market share was the right one.
  - c. While this was not a classic Technology Strategy Board area, not being really technology led, it still represented a good innovation opportunity
  - d. It was a good thing that DFT wanted to use the Catapult to break out of the modal silos but the Catapult does need to focus on the business driver.
  - e. There was a need to focus more on direct economic value drivers with tangible benefits, albeit recognising the inherent inaccuracy in measuring that. It cannot be left to simply assert indirect benefit.
32. The Board **approved** the Business plan and recommended it to BIS.

### **Future Cities Catapult (paper: TSB2013-05-07)**

33. The Chair welcomed the Future Cities Catapult team to the meeting. He reminded the Board that it had approved the Catapult in principle in an earlier meeting that the task before it now was to consider the approval of the proposed business plan, which had been scrutinised by and recommended by the Executive. He further reminded the Board that funding approval would also be required in BIS and Treasury.
34. Sir David King introduced the vision and mission and the Catapult team. He asserted that there was no one else with this ambition, bringing universities, business and cities together. He saw the Catapult as becoming a central part of government smart cities strategy and live projects had already started.
35. Peter Madden presented the details of the business plan. In response to questions he added the following:
- a. Building the lab, a unique core facility, is a reasonably well understood process but securing the right team and expertise would be the difficult and expensive

element. Access to the data streams and compute power was relatively straightforward.

- b. The market in this area had not yet coalesced so it was not clear exactly when a strong commercial income stream could be expected to happen. The World Bank and the EU take long times to take decisions so it was better to under-promise and overachieve.
36. Sir David King informed the Board that he had accepted a full time job in the FCO (Foreign Secretary's Special Representative for Climate Change) and had dropped all of his other interests with the exception of the Catapult. He saw significant synergies between the Catapult and the FCO role.
37. The Catapult team withdrew.

### **Future Cities Catapult Closed session**

38. In closed session discussion the following comments were made:
- a. The proposal, whilst strong elsewhere, demonstrated a lack of income ambition which needed addressing soon, so that a plan is in place to deliver a higher level of commercial income by the end of the 5 year plan.
  - b. This business plan cannot be approved without insisting on greater aspiration. It remained unclear where the commercial income was likely to come from. More clarity was needed about the industry engagement context.
  - c. This Catapult will need to demonstrate how it will collaborate with the Connected Digital Economy, Transport Systems and Satellite Applications Catapults.
  - d. Sara Murray declared that without a more ambitious commercial income generation plan, this was not a business plan she could support.
39. The chair summarised the discussions, noting the concerns but also the need to have a longer term plan in place to allow establishment of the team, the location and the projects. He suggested approval of the business but with a clear request to ask the Catapult to come back in six months with a revised commercial income plan.
40. The Board **approved** the Business plan and recommended it to BIS but asked the Catapult to come back in six months with a revised commercial income generation plan for the latter period of the 5 year plan (**action**).

### **Activity and Resource Implications of Spending Review 2015-2016 & Budget Announcements** (paper: TSB2013-05-06)

41. Iain Gray introduced the paper. He explained that the Spending Review outcome, combined with new responsibilities from the 2013 Budget including APC, ATI and the Agritech Catalyst would place significant short to medium term pressure on the team and it was now necessary to seek support from the Board for increased headcount. Lessons had been learned from past increases, e.g. the Biomedical Catalyst, when the extra effort was not taken on soon enough. He reported that he had not yet received a confirming budget letter from BIS and when it arrives it may well include some caveats and activities outside the original proposal. He reported that he was campaigning for support for the original proposal.
42. He reported that for some of these activities it was necessary to commence recruiting quickly. It was getting harder to recruit in the current market. Despite the lack of budget to increase strength ahead of 2015/16 it was necessary to start

straight away. It was no longer allowed to respond to short term needs through interim short term contracts. It was also necessary to take on some short term HR support to help with the recruitment. In discussion the following comments were made:

- a. There were some massively risky issues here which create a good deal of concern.
- b. The Board should receive and advise on a recruitment plan and eventual organisation map and risk register as this was an exceptional item (**action**).
- c. The Technology Strategy Board office did not have sufficient floor space to accommodate these new people but, with the move to a field working arrangement for technologists, should be able to cope. There remained a need to find ways of working that maintains good contact with field workers.

43. The Board endorsed the proposed approach

**SME Support package** paper: TSB2013-05-15

44. Mark Glover introduced the paper. He thanked those Board members who had made input to the development process. He described the proposed programme. In discussion the following comments were made:

- a. Those companies that deliver most growth did not appear to be the target of the content of the paper. More emphasis should be placed on medium sized companies and on those seeking to grow to medium sized.
- b. We focus support on companies who have demonstrated growth ambition by applying for R&D support. We should ask what else we can do to help them succeed.
- c. Many companies with growth potential don't seek support because of lack of ambition and competence, but that can be coached and changed.
- d. The BIS offering for fast growth is Growth Accelerator and that is not necessarily the right package.
- e. We must offer more support to SMEs than just money.

45. Mark Glover thanked the Board and undertook to take its comments on board.

**Introduction to 2014 Delivery Plan** paper: TSB2013-05-10

46. Mark Glover introduced the paper which, he explained, set out the areas of change since the 2013 Delivery Plan, on which it was appropriate to focus. He reminded the Board of the need to think about priorities as there was a lot on the coming agenda. Examples included the need for sub-national connectivity, the need to prepare for the next spending review. He informed the Board that a professional economist had been appointed who would be starting a programme of work in support of priority setting

47. He reminded the Board that it was necessary to issue the Delivery Plan in March 2014. So it would be necessary to focus down at the December Board meeting. In discussion the following comments were made:

- a. There was a need to demonstrate in the plan how the programme supported the 8 Great Technologies and the Industrial Strategy
- b. The Board should see evidence building as part of the work plan in setting priorities.

- c. A clear priority should be placed on procurement and SBRI
  - d. The coming months should include a debate about whether the Technology Strategy Board should support businesses in getting funding for moving from commercialisable IP to jobs and growth
  - e. EU and sub national policy should be priorities for further development.
48. The Board agreed to revisit the Delivery Plan in December

**Catapult priority process** paper: TSB2013-05-05

49. David Bott introduced the paper. He explained that the two most recently announced Catapults had to be defined quickly because of the nature of the relationship with BIS. Given the time constraints, the philosophy used was to stay close to the Technology Strategy Board thematic priorities as Catapults will need the Technology Strategy Board to have grants competitions running in their areas of interest if they are to have any chance of obtaining the grant funding they require. Diagnostics for Stratified Medicine came from the Stratified Medicine Innovation Platform. Energy Systems was on the original top 10 list and the Technology Strategy Board is about to launch a Catalyst programme in this area. There were few other viable candidates. Nuclear was considered but the policy arena was too weak. Other health candidates had not emerged and food was already well supported by centres. In discussion the following comments were made:
- a. The Technology Strategy Board should be proposing centres ahead of the curve.
  - b. Simon Edmonds commented that Vince Cable was seeking a strategy for the next phase in time for the Budget with a major ambition of matching the scale of Fraunhofers. It was necessary to develop this in partnership with ministers, There was a need for clarity on timing and resource needs.
  - c. Education could be a topic for consideration but OU have a good programme going and it doesn't need a Catapult, but it probably could do with a wider supporting programme.
  - d. The process should examine what has changed since the original long list was drawn up rather than start from scratch.
50. Amanda Brooks reported that Vince Cable wanted a vision for a stable structure with ambition, scale and purpose.

**Oversight Committee for Catapults** *oral item*

51. Ian Shott reported that he was looking at where the Oversight Committee for Catapults were going. He had spoken to some of the Board members (Phil Smith, Mike Carr and Colin Paynter). He proposed that the Technology Strategy Board should be taking strong "family management" role. Since the last meeting he had concluded that a new formal Committee was necessary and that the Board should take the lead. The Current Oversight Committee felt that the Technology Strategy Board needed to monitor performance and guide and steer.
52. The Chairman commented that the Board needed a strategic position for how it wanted Catapults to relate to the rest of the programme and the Technology Strategy Board's strategy setting. Simon Edmonds undertook to bring a paper with documentation of past process, analysis and an evidence-based proposal for future approach to the December meeting (**action**).

**Audit and Risk Assurance Committee** Paper: TSB2013-05-14

53. Graham Hutchins introduced the paper. He highlighted the new quorum requirements and annual meeting cycle. He pointed out that sign-off of accounts will be in mid-June.
54. The Board **approved** the terms of reference of the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee.

**Risk Management Review** Paper: TSB2013-05-11

55. Graham Hutchins introduced the paper. He explained that changes as a result of the review would be modest but positive, with better role definition. Iain Gray reported that the risk review with BIS had been a productive and supportive discussion.
56. The Board **approved** the new risk management policy

**AOB**

57. Stewart Davies asked whether the Technology Strategy Board was bidding to run EENs against private sector companies and where the necessary expertise would come from. Mark Glover reported that this was under analysis. The Technology Strategy Board expected to form a consortium through an independent CLG company with the best of the existing service providers to bid.
58. Colin Paynter commented that this had been an excellent meeting and expressed his thanks to the executive

**Closed session**

59. The Board primarily discussed the current senior management renewal. Other issues discussed included: Output measures, relationship with BIS ministers over Catapults, Catapult branding, preparation for budgets and autumn statements, managing competing political demands, key stakeholder mapping.

**Summary of decisions and actions:**

No	Action	Responsibility	Target date
1	<b>Paragraph 7:</b> The Board <b>approved</b> the nomination of Colin Paynter to the Remuneration Committee		
2	<b>Paragraph 8a:</b> speak to Andrew Witty in advance of submitting a Technology Strategy Board response to the Witty Review	Iain Gray and Phil Smith	Jan 2013
3	<b>Paragraph 8h:</b> Investigate causes of possible Board process failure which led to a misunderstanding of the implementation of KTN optimisation	Guy Rickett	December 2013 meeting
4	<b>Paragraph 8i:</b> Discuss the KPMG reports on Narec and proposals with any Board members who request it.	Simon Edmonds	

5	<b>Paragraph 12a:</b> Bring forward a paper with recommendations on the next stage of the communications plan, including story/branding, before it starts to be implemented	Aileen Thompson	December 2013 meeting
6	<b>Paragraph 18:</b> Seek introduction through David Grant to discuss and compare performance measures with Dstl.	Mark Glover	March 2014
7	<b>Paragraph 25</b> Extend process review to look at the evaluation elements of the process framework and address how to organise a set of functions that will deliver.	Iain Gray	March 2014
8	<b>Paragraph 29c</b> Obtain a clear map and review of the Transport Systems Catapult's competitors or collaborators ( <b>action</b> ).	Simon Edmonds	March 2014
9	<b>Paragraph 32:</b> The Board <b>approved</b> the Business plan of the Transport Systems Catapult and recommended it to BIS		
10	<b>Paragraph 40:</b> The Board <b>approved</b> the Business plan of the Future Cities Catapult and recommended it to BIS.		
11	<b>Paragraph 40:</b> Task the Future Cities Catapult to provide a revised commercial income generation plan for the latter period of the 5 year plan.	Simon Edmonds	March 2014
12	<b>Paragraph 42b</b> Provide a recruitment plan, eventual organisation map and associated risk register for Board approval	Iain Gray	December 2013 meeting
13	<b>Paragraph 52</b> Bring forward an evidence-based Catapult strategy proposal, documenting past processes.	Simon Edmonds	December 2013 meeting
14	<b>Paragraph 54</b> The Board <b>approved</b> the terms of reference of the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee		
15	<b>Paragraph 56</b> The Board <b>approved</b> the new risk management policy		