



Trade Union side access: in parts

Minutes of the MRC-UKRI Council business meeting, held at the 58 Victoria Embankment on 2 March 2022

Attendees		
MRC Council	Management Board	MRC Head Office / observers
Richard Murley (Chair)	Rob Buckle	Rachel Benny
John Iredale (joined at 09:30)	Patrick Chinnery	Christine Mulligan
Kim Graham	Hugh Dunlop (joined at 10:15)	Ivan Pavlov
Precious Lunga (joined at 09:06)	Claire Newland	
Jill Pell	Jonathan Pearce	Guests/Observers
Munir Pirmohamed	Susan Simon	Rebecca Barlow (Item 9)
Andy Richards		Emily Brown (Item 6)
Graham Spittle		Géraldine Clément-Stoneham (Item 11)
Irene Tracey		Megan Dowie (Item 7)
Pauline Williams		Gavin Mapstone (item 4 and 5)
Louise Wood		Isobel Stephen (UKRI observer)
		Ian Viney (item 10)
		Heike Weber

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Council business meeting was a hybrid meeting held on 2 March 2022 at the MRC Head Office at 58 Victoria Embankment with some members and presenters joining via Zoom videoconference. The Chair, Mr Richard Murley, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies were received from Roger Highfield and Charlotte Watts.

2. Register of declared interests

Mr Murley asked members to send any updated declarations to the secretariat.

3 & 3a. Minutes the joint Strategy Board / Council meeting and Council business meeting held on 9 December 2021

The minutes of the joint Strategy Board / Council meeting and Council business meeting held on 9 December 2021 were approved as accurate records of the meetings.

3b. Matters Arising: Quarterly Operations Update

Council noted the Matters Arising paper with the quarterly operations dashboard, which contained a top-level view of finance, information on risk, HR and business critical activities.

4. Finance report

Mr Gavin Mapstone, the MRC interim Finance Director, presented the finance report covering updates on the 2021/22 outturn, budget allocations, the extramural commitment budget, and year-to-date results.

The MRC underspend increased, following the general trend of other councils, and was £45m lower than allocation. This arose due to challenges deploying funding and slippage arising on existing investments.

MRC did not receive sight of its full allocation for 2021-22 until late March and its ability to take forward new spend initiatives was constrained by a need to ensure UKRI did not overcommit funding and uncertainty over future allocations.

The impacts of the pandemic on the existing studies supported through the response mode funding, slippage on Covid-specific programmes supported by hypothecated allocations, as well as funding related to talent and knowledge exchange saw further underspends arise on planned and existing investments.

Council expressed concerns about the apparent growth of the underspend. The office clarified that the underspend releases the pressure from a usually overcommitted UKRI budget and while some of the MRC's strategic plans did not get realised as planned this year, budgets allocated to MRC boards and panels had been fully committed.

It was further explained that MRC look to carry funds intended for managed programmes forward and that there were wider means to manage funds within UKRI. However, when slippage occurs within the core research budget category, it needs to be absorbed in future allocations. Thus, any extensions would need to be tensioned against funding available for the new awards.

Discussing the figures, members underscored the importance of focusing planning efforts on in-year flexibility to allow the MRC to quickly utilise underspend budgets by having prepared a range of projects that could be quickly funded. Management Board confirmed that they were working on ways to utilise funds, for example through generating rolling programmes, supporting infrastructure, or providing funds to perform new data sweeps in existing cohort studies. However, the range of tools to quickly address underspend was limited due to the need for research organisations to have spent funding within the financial year, and activities like career support would require a longer spending profile. Members asked Management Board to provide Council with an overview of rapid spend options utilised in the past and planned for the future to discuss and strategise their use over the next few years.

Dr Jonathan Pearce, MRC Director for Strategy and Planning, then presented Council with some illustrative scenarios used by the UKRI Board to identify the impacts and trade-offs of different spending options, to triangulate on the optimum balance of funding allocations across UKRI. Members were informed that the UKRI was prioritising the resilience and sustainability of the UK's research and innovation (R&I) system to find solutions to the biggest national and global challenges. Investments in infrastructure would have a tighter focus on the long-term sustainability of supporting UKRI-specific investments. There would be further investment in talent and people with a view to be more coherent across different

schemes and to provide a simpler offering for the community. Programmatic investments would concentrate on the strategic research directed towards identified priority challenges, including through strategic cross-council initiatives. Dr Pearce noted that the core Innovate UK budget would be ring-fenced and would be receiving a considerable uplift. There were ongoing discussions on where in the innovation space the MRC could have shared interests and ambitions (for example, in genomics). Within the international category, the focus would be on developing and sustaining international partnerships, including through lead agency agreements with world leading research nations and funders and pivoting of existing partnerships towards challenges where relevant. The MRC would need to consider how we deploy our plans in this domain.

Council was then updated on the provisional allocations for 2022/23 and the MRC indicative spending review allocations, which suggested a 14 per cent increase in the core budget by 2024/25. Potential changes included a contribution from World Class Labs (WCL) funding to support UKRI infrastructure projects and a contribution from the core research allocation to support pan-UKRI inter-disciplinary research. Some of the anticipated challenges were related to commissioning activity to utilise increased funding in future years, building upon investment in Covid programmes and national core studies that established capability for future research, sustaining infrastructure within laboratories, maintaining UK Biobank investment and planned reductions in Operational Expenditure (OpEx).

Members welcomed the uplift in the MRC budget but were concerned by the high current inflation rate and the risk that in real terms the budget increase would be less than expected. Council considered the opportunities and challenges for the MRC spending over the next 2-3 years and commented that it was important to think not only how to invest funds but also how to manage the investments once they are made. Council commented that while the funding landscape was still evolving, it was necessary to maintain flexibility to be able to adapt to arising challenges.

Council noted the update and thanked Mr Mapstone and Dr Pearce for the overview.

5. Science commitment budget 2022/23

Council was presented with a paper on the 2022/23 commitment budget planning. Members were reminded that the commitment budget represents MRC's 'business as usual' funding distributed through the regular and repeating response mode funding schemes awarding research grants, fellowships and studentships. The updated options presented to Council, following modelling of an expected spending review outcome, were based upon a more positive than previously considered scenario of an increased commitment budget of £400m in 2022/23. The like-for-like comparator in 2021/22 was £307m, meaning that additional £93m were available to be applied across MRC funding schemes. A range of pressures related to the MRC investment in institutes, such as for example budget planning for the London Institute for Medical Sciences (LMS), were taken into account outside the commitment budget allowing additional latitude. It was noted that research board and panel budgets had been increased in the current financial year, but there remained uncertainty regarding a potential increase in the volume of response-mode applications, as a result of the reduced charity funding.

Council was asked to discuss and agree on the preferred distribution of the budget between MRC funding streams. Three options were presented: i) to provide equal growth across all funding streams, ii) to increase flexibility for strategic priorities through an increased Strategy Board budget, iii) to prioritise growth in fellowships with some flexibility for strategic funding.

Members expressed concerns over the very low success rates of the MRC Career Development Award scheme, while noting that all awards scoring 8 and above were awarded last year, and further pressures arising from Wellcome discontinuing some of their schemes targeted to support individual researchers. It was pointed out that while 'people and careers' was one of the major priorities for the UKRI, it was unclear how the organisation

was planning to support early and mid-career scientists. Members agreed that in the absence of clarity about any future equivalent of the UKRI's Future Leaders Fellowships (FLF) scheme, it was important to signal to the community that the MRC remains in business and is supportive of individual careers. However, considerations would need to be given to how MRC fellowships should be positioned alongside any future pan-UKRI career support schemes. Members also highlighted the importance of thinking about supporting talent and careers more broadly across a range of MRC investments, including research grants, funding provided to institutes and units, and initiatives supported through the Strategy Board budget.

Members endorsed the recommended option iii), which prioritised growth in fellowships with some flexibility for funding strategic priorities, underscoring the importance of maintaining agility in order to be able to quickly adapt to the varying level of demand and creation of any new UKRI funding schemes. Council also highlighted the need to ensure that the response mode funding through applications to MRC research boards and panels receives sufficient support at the level that is sustainable in the longer term. Members wished to ensure that the broad range of MRC constituencies received adequate support and asked the office to provide, later in the year, more granular data that would reflect the dynamics of individual components within funding streams, in addition to the high-level figures.

6. Outcome of the quinquennial review (QQR) of the Francis Crick Institute (the Crick)

The MRC Chief Science Office, Dr Rob Buckle, presented Council with the outcome of the first QQR of the Francis Crick Institute. The QQR of the institute had been led by the MRC on behalf of the Institute's Founders – MRC, Cancer Research UK (CRUK), Wellcome, University College London, Kings College London and Imperial College London. Whilst the constituent research programmes of the Institute were reviewed by a rolling programme co-ordinated by the Crick executive, the QQR process was designed to take a higher-level assessment of the Director's vision and strategy for the Crick, its balance of activities, its performance metrics and value for money, and the overall scientific quality, impact and 'added value' of the Institute. An Institute Review Panel of national and international experts was chaired by Professor Laurie Glimcher (President and CEO, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Harvard). The Financial Review of the Institute was being conducted separately, along the scientific review, and was still ongoing at the time that the Institute Review Panel made their recommendations. Council had been provided with the final draft of the Financial Review – which concluded that the Crick operates within a sound system of financial management and governance - and was informed that the Institute had not yet had time to respond to it.

Overall, the Institute Review Panel concluded that the Crick had made impressive achievements and progress to date and was delivering exceptional science supported by extremely high-quality facilities and research platforms. The Crick had established itself as an internationally leading research institute and was on track to maintain and build on this position over the next quinquennium. The Panel scored the Institute 10 (out of 10) for the past work and 10 (out of 10) for the future plans. The QQR review Panel recommended that Funders support the base case scenario presented by the Institute (£704m), which reflected a ~18 per cent cash increase (ignoring indexation) on current core funding (£595m).

Council members were informed that in the Crick's response to the Panel report, the Director challenged several aspects of the QQR process. Council members were presented with the detailed office analysis of the Crick's response and the Panel Chair's rebuttal to the central objections of the Director. Both documents confirmed that the final report fully and accurately reflected the sentiments and conclusions of the Institute Review Panel. The MRC would be responding to the Director that MRC was not rejecting the Report of the Institute Review Panel.

Council members expressed their full support of the office view, noting a particularly strong, clear and well-argued reply of the Panel Chair. Members also endorsed the recommendations of the Review Panel in full.

It was noted that both Wellcome and CRUK accepted the report and its recommendations, and Council was asked to agree in principle on the Crick's future budget in order to provide the office a clear negotiating position to discuss and agree with the co-funders of the Institute in finalising the final funding envelope.

Under the proposed base-case scenario of £704m in total, an MRC contribution of 40 per cent - in line with our current proportion - would amount to £281m (a 9 per cent increase on level funding after indexation).

Members confirmed their support for the proposed level of funding of the Institute at £704m for the next quinquennium and endorsed the proposed approach to negotiate MRC's contribution with the other funders.

7. Outcome of the quinquennial review of the MRC Oxford Institute for Radiation Oncology

Dr Megan Dowie, MRC Head of Molecular and Cellular Medicine, presented Council with the outcome of the QQR of the MRC Oxford Institute for Radiation Oncology (OIRO). OIRO was originally a partnership investment with the University of Oxford and previously CRUK, which withdrew its funding from June 2020 following a strategic realignment of its portfolio. The MRC manages OIRO as part of its unit investment portfolio, although the funding model of OIRO differs from other MRC units.

In accordance with standard practice, the QQR Subcommittee undertook an assessment of the quality, impact, and productivity of OIRO's past and future core-funded work, including science, training, and translation, together with the strategy, quality, and impact of OIRO as a whole. The Subcommittee assessment identified several issues, including a limited number of competitive programmes, lack of full coherence with the proposed vision, and the nature of the future vision. OIRO received an overall score of 7 (out of 10) for the future work submitted for assessment, and the Subcommittee recommended that MRC strategic investment in OIRO to be discontinued. It was noted however that it would be valuable to maintain support for the internationally competitive programmes hosted by the Unit, in order to retain existing excellent science and capacity in an underserved area whilst OIRO transitioned out of core-funding support.

The recommendations included a wind-down offer of £11,357k, which included a 12-month transition period, 5-year support for four internationally competitive programmes and support for existing PhD students until completion.

Members endorsed the recommendation to discontinue MRC strategic investment in OIRO, with the closure of the Unit by April 2023. It was agreed that OIRO would receive a wind-down package in line with the recommendation to ensure a smooth wrapping up/transition of the Unit's activities.

Council discussed that it would be important to clearly communicate to the MRC research community that this is not a dis-investment in the field. Although the MRC had also closed its Cancer Unit a year ago, it continues to maintain strategic investment in cancer through other large investments, including the MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology, the Francis Crick Institute, UK Biobank and the MRC Human Genetics Unit.

The office noted that in addition to standard closure procedures, the MRC had signalled to its research community that the Council would go through a process of revising the MRC unit portfolio and that if this structure of the investment is not further required, MRC would support strong science through other means.

Council asked the office to prepare a breakdown of the overall MRC investment portfolio based on research areas, such as for example, dementia, cancer, mental health, etc., that could be used to showcase MRC investments in different research fields in communications to various stakeholders.

8. MRC Strategic Delivery Plan update

Following from the discussion at the previous Council meeting in December 2021, Dr Heike Weber, MRC's Associate Director Strategy and Planning, presented a new draft of the MRC Strategic Delivery Plan (SDP), which set out MRC's ambitions for the medium-term and actions over the new spending review period. Dr Weber noted that this time the development of the SDP was more complex than in the past. As such, the SDP would be embedded in and connected with the UKRI strategy and corporate delivery plan. The document was expected to provide both an integrated MRC-wide strategy and delivery plan, and to support internal prioritization and decision making. The SDP would also serve as a tool for communication and engagement with the scientific community and stakeholders about MRC's vision and priorities. The plan presented to Council was re-drafted following previous feedback from members and had a reduced number of priorities, which were made less granular, emphasised MRC's flagship investments through increased references to institutes, units, UK Biobank, etc., and contained more specific actions.

Dr Weber said that the MRC would utilise its SDP to become a better integrated and more inclusive organisation with a stronger capability for prioritisation and catalysing positive change. The integration would be expected to occur at various levels: within the council, across UKRI and at the level of health ecosystem. For instance, the MRC would prioritise research on integrated understanding of human disease and advanced therapeutics (supported through all of its research boards), contribute to advancing national priorities on Health, Aging and Wellbeing, as well as tackling infections, and would support the sector through broadening industry partnerships and advancing the place agenda.

The new Major Investments Board would be one of the key mechanisms that would allow MRC to prioritise its investments, including for national level infrastructures and the MRC unit and institute portfolio. Environmental sustainability, EDI and public and patient involvement were the key areas that MRC was looking to catalyse.

Members asked the office to clarify whether the SDP was expected to provide a framework of the MRC strategy or focus on the execution aspects. Dr Weber explained that the document was illustrating how MRC was planning to achieve its aspirations. It was noted that it was important to recognise that the government would be evaluating what the UKRI as a whole was going to deliver through its constituent councils, and thus it would be important for the SDP to reflect the narratives of other councils and Innovate UK.

Council suggested that the document needed to demonstrate more ambition, should focus on outcomes painting a picture of what the success would look like - which would support evaluation of how the plan was working in practice – and mention sustainability plans. It was advised that the document should also reflect views of, and appeal to research communities served by the MRC.

Members were concerned that the SDP represented a top-down approach and were reassured that there were no plans to reducing the response-mode funding through MRC boards and panels and that this would be an integral part of supporting the SDP. It was noted that prioritising and seeding new research areas through managed calls would allow the MRC to leverage additional funding from UKRI.

Members commented that although it was mentioned in the text, it should be more apparent from the SDP that commercial partnerships would be looked at beyond pharma and include other industries (for example, diagnostics) and that the draft should be more explicit on how the MRC would be delivering against the levelling up agenda to build on the MRC investments, for example, in the Midlands, Scotland, and other areas.

In summary, members agreed that the document needed to be bolder in articulating MRC's ambitions and should better demonstrate how the council would interact with other parts of UKRI to contribute to the strategic objectives of UKRI. It was agreed that the next version of the document would be circulated to members to seek their further input.

9. Update on MRC's evaluation programme

Dr Ian Viney, MRC's Director of Strategic Evaluation and Impact, provided Council with the highlights of the recent evaluation and analysis work, highlighting projects on:

- the barriers and facilitators of transition to independence for early career researchers (ECRs) with the analysis of quantitative and qualitative (interview) data and feedback from Higher Education Institutions, to help shape MRC's offer for ECRs
- tracking evidence of realising benefits of MRC research institutes, which would be helpful to shaping the way that institutes report to MRC in the future
- MRC PhD studentships - understanding career paths of MRC students and their use of skills
- impact case studies - all research councils were actively putting effort into this to improve advocacy and taking advantage of the information collected in the recent Research Excellence Framework exercise.
- the cost and benefits of the funding process – a study team from Kings College would work with applicants to understand the effort put in when submitting proposals for funding; this work would support the creation of a simpler, better funding service by the UKRI.

Council members learnt that there were plans to analyse the regional diversity of the MRC spend and who are the main beneficiaries of the results of research supported by the MRC. The team was seeking a collaboration with economic geographers to extend this work. The evaluation and analysis team was also interested in starting some new work to look at the scale and scope of MRC intra- and extramural funding and its impact.

Dr Viney noted that his team aimed to generate insights into tractable, timely, and credible "research on research" questions. The team was advertising for a second round of secondments to help progress a variety of projects that would help to demonstrate the breadth of what the MRC was doing. Council was asked to advise and comment on the current work and ideas for future projects, such as creating measures against the MRC's Strategic Delivery Plan.

Council noted the update and commented that it was important for the relatively small Evaluation and Analysis team to carefully prioritise the diverse projects that they were undertaking. Members thought that it was important for MRC to have good quality case studies to draw upon, and Dr Viney reassured council members that the team would explore crowdsourcing approaches to collect this material.

Members agreed that a good alignment of work with the delivery plan was important and recommended to focus the efforts on closer collaboration with the strategy group to provide evidence that would help the MRC to demonstrate value-add of its investments. This would also feed into any future evaluation of the UKRI and MRC performance by the government. Levelling up and fostering relationship with industry would likely receive scrutiny. Thus, it was timely to think about the indicators and data that would demonstrate how MRC contributes to the government agenda.

10. MRC Culture project update

Council was updated on the continued work in relation to the MRC culture project. Professor John Iredale, MRC interim Executive Chair, reminded members that it had been a year after Wicked People started working with MRC on this project. Discussions now were had how to continue work on the organisational culture and it was agreed that a point had been reached

at which Management Board and other colleagues from across the office could pick up and progress work on the identified issues. Three strands of work were mentioned:

1. The 'Rewiring project' - led by Dr Jonathan Pearce (Director for Strategy and Planning) - would continue, and Wicked People would assist with it for another month
2. Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) is a key priority in the MRC and one of the new MRC values. The EDI forum continued to provide a vibrant platform for discussions and was a source of great ideas. Dr Suzan Simon (Director of Estates) as the Senior MRC EDI Champion was working with colleagues across the office to collect and implement best practise from other organisations
3. Mentorship programme was being developed and there was a lot of enthusiasm in participating in it from across different parts of the MRC.

Professor Iredale said that he has sufficient confidence that there was enough momentum to generate a number of positive changes in culture and noted that the challenge would be how to operationalise them and build an adequate organisational structure around them.

It was noted that the office saw a positive cultural shift in attitude towards EDI, as well as in empowering people on their employee journeys. Work was progressing to better understand current resourcing issues and pinch points in order to support people in managing a diverse range of tasks and projects. It was recognised that MRC had been through four difficult years, becoming part of a larger organisation and then working its way through the pandemic, which put a lot of stress on people, who had to manage their day jobs in isolation. Hence, the focus was now on breaking siloes between different parts of the MRC, rebuilding cross-office connections and empowering effective working.

Professor Iredale mentioned regular Town Hall meetings organised to update staff and raise awareness among MRC employees about what is happening in different parts of the office. He said that these were usually very engaging sessions, during which people had the opportunity to ask questions anonymously and often made valuable suggestions. Professor Iredale also mentioned efforts of the internal group, led by Dr Mark Pitman (Head of Science Performance and Reviews), which continued to work on operationalising positive changes.

Council underscored the importance of ensuring that the MRC benefits from the broader views and perspectives of its staff. Members asked what was being done to generate diverse role models, represent varying needs of individuals and create diverse leadership to support change. Members were informed that ideas for practical steps were discussed by the EDI forum, which has representatives of individuals with protected characteristics and that interventions included MRC mentorship and apprenticeship programmes. Professor Iredale mentioned plans, from his experience of NHS, of increasing diversity, including in leadership to support change, through creating a cadre of diverse senior associate non-executives.

Members discussed how they, as Council, could get a better sense of what people thought was important. It was suggested that inviting different people to speak to Council about various aspects of EDI could provide views from a broader and diverse set of individuals.

11. Update on the new UKRI Open Access policy

Ms Géraldine Clément-Stoneham, MRC's Head of Knowledge Management and Scholarly Communication, presented to Council a paper with an update of the new UKRI Open Access policy and its upcoming implementation. Ms Clément-Stoneham gave an overview of the new principles, highlighted the key differences between the current and new policy and outlined those elements that remained the same. It was noted that some changes would come into effect from 1 April 2022, while others (for example, regarding in-scope monographs, book chapters, edited collections and long-form outputs) would be implemented later, from 1 January 2024. Council received an overview of the implications of

the new policy for MRC establishments, including institutes and units, as well as for individual researchers funded by the MRC. Ms Clément-Stoneham also outlined routes for compliance with the new policy, including through publishing in open access or subscription journals, and through ensuring that the accepted version of the manuscript is made accessible via Europe PubMed Central. Members were informed that the office had held a virtual workshop with Open Access Champions from different institutions in December 2021 to discuss upcoming changes and to gather questions and concerns from the research community. There were plans for further communications to support the roll-out of the policy and for activities to monitor the uptake of the policy.

Members noted the update and thanked Ms Clément-Stoneham for the presentation.

12. Council forward look for 2022/23 and relationship between Council and the Executive

Members noted the forward look for Council meetings in 2022/23, based on the Council's work plan, some strategic discussion topics identified for the joint Strategy Board and Council meetings, and plans of the office to re-start holding regional stakeholder meetings of Council.

Council was asked to consider additional potential topics for future discussions. Members expressed their interest in getting an overview of the totality of MRC funding in key specific fields (for example, cancer, dementia), regular updates on the real-time spending pressures and trends, understanding how the risks tally with the decision-making process, and in bringing the ideas and activities of the EDI Forum to Council.

Members suggested that EDI considerations and implications should be highlighted in papers submitted to Council and asked the office to amend the paper template accordingly.

Members also discussed how the relationship between Council and Management Board might develop to give greater effectiveness to each, whilst maximising the value-add that the relationship gives to MRC overall. It was suggested that the Executive engage in more regular interactions with individual Council members to utilise their broad expertise in relevant areas, including sustainability, infrastructure, communications, etc. Such closer engagement might achieve a stronger link between Council and the MRC strategy. Members noted that joint meetings with Strategy Board were also a valuable tool helping to establish the direction of travel.

Members agreed that offline conversations should be used more, which would also allow more efficient and focused discussions at Council meetings.

Professor Iredale asked Council members to let the office know of any further suggestions they might have and reminded them of the opportunity to provide further feedback as part of the upcoming Council's self-assessment process.

13. Any other business

Members were asked to consider the Terms of Reference and membership of the Major Investments Board (MIB), updated since initial discussion at December Council, which would command a budget, as determined by Council, in order to be able to fund/manage the MRC major investment portfolio. MIB would report to Council. A major part of its activity in the first year would be to review the portfolio position of existing units and make recommendations to Council as to their potential continuation under the Unit 2.0 model or closure. It would also be responsible for decisions on the opening, maintenance or closure of Unit 2.0 investments. It was proposed that the new Board would be established by June/July 2022 and would consist of 11-12 members, with additional ad hoc members included to complement the existing expertise as necessary. It was envisaged that the Board would meet on a 2-monthly basis for the first six months and three times per year thereafter.

Council endorsed the proposal, noting that expertise in translation should be represented in MIB and that the new Board should aim to convene as soon as practically possible. Members asked the Head Office to report the progress made by the new body at the December Council meeting.

On a separate issue Dr Susan Simon suggested to present regular updates on the MRC environmental sustainability actions in the form of dashboards that would be included in Council papers for information. Members agreed.

Before closing the meeting Council members also reflected on whether there had been any equality and diversity implications resulting from any discussions and decisions made.

14. Council private business

Following the meeting members held a private business meeting.

Items for Information

Council noted the following papers for information:

15. Effectiveness of Business Continuity in Institutes during COVID: lessons learnt

16. Updates from the Executive