



Minutes of the 23rd meeting of NERC Council in UK Research and Innovation

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH COUNCIL

Twenty-third meeting of NERC Council in UK Research and Innovation held at the National Oceanography Centre, Southampton on Thursday, 7 December 2023.

Members present:

Professor Peter Liss (Interim Executive Chair), Rashik Parmar (Senior Independent Member), Judith Batchelar (part) (via Zoom), Professor Hannah Cloke (via Zoom), Professor Sir Stephen Holgate (via Zoom), Professor Mike Kendall, Clare Matterson, Gordon McGregor (via Zoom), Professor John Pyle, Professor David Hannah, Chair, Science Committee (via Zoom), Charlie McNichol-Fardon, Chair, Future Leaders Council (via Zoom)

NERC/UKRI Directors (Head Office): Nigel Bird (Director, Major Projects), Alison Robinson (Deputy Executive Chair and Director, Business Delivery and Insight) (part) (via Zoom), Professor Susan Waldron (Director, Research and Skills), Dr Iain Williams (Director, Strategic Partnerships)

Apologies: Dr Matthew Harwood, Dr Rebecca Heaton, Michael Lewis, Professor Gideon Henderson, CSA, Defra, Tim Bianek (UKRI, Chief Operating Officer)

Other attendees: Professor Dame Ottoline Leyser, Item 3, Tom Haynes, Item 4, Sarah Turner, Item 5, Kate Hamer, Item 6, Chloe Somers, Item 7, Anna Angus-Smyth, Item 8

Secretariat: Helen Page, Michelle Wickenden

Introductory items

1. Executive Chair's welcome, unconfirmed minutes of the 22nd meeting of NERC Council and Decisions and Actions (Oral)

1.1 Peter Liss welcomed members to the twenty-third meeting of NERC Council.

1.2 Peter Liss asked members to ensure their declared interests were kept updated via the self-service portal and asked if there were any vested interests in any of the items being discussed today. None were declared.

1.3 Peter Liss asked members for any amendments and matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting. No amendments were made, and the minutes of the twenty-second meeting were confirmed as a good record.

1.4 Peter Liss advised that the actions from the previous meeting had been completed.

2. Executive Chair's update (Oral)

2.1 Peter Liss gave an oral update on some of the key activities since the previous Council

meeting.

a) NERC Council Retreat

Peter Liss informed Council that the NERC Council retreat meeting would move from 6 March 2024 to 19 June 2024 (with the Council meeting on the following day, 20 June 2024). He explained that this was to allow time for the substantive Executive Chair to take up their post, adding that the Council meeting to be held on 7 March 2024 would be held in Swindon.

b) NERC Diversity Survey

Peter Liss informed Council that a NERC Diversity Survey would be circulated for completion in January 2024. He reminded Council that this was an annual exercise to collect diversity data from members which enabled NERC to report on diversity and improve under-representation on NERC boards and committees.

c) NERC Doctoral Training Investments – CDT/DTP update

Peter Liss informed Council that there was a paper, for discussion by exception, on NERC Doctoral Training investments. He explained that NERC would be investing more in CDT (focal) awards to allow for collective training, with the successful bids due to be announced soon. Council asked whether the move to a more strategic focus was driven by UKRI and Susan Waldron explained that Council had previously agreed this approach.

Peter Liss explained that changes to doctoral training investments (now landscape awards) had provided an opportunity for co-working with BBSRC. Susan Waldron added that further information on this would be provided to Council once the pre-announcement was made.

d) House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee report

Peter Liss informed Council that the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee had produced a report on the Arctic environment which contained some recommendations including the suggestion that NERC should have a new research vessel dedicated to research in the Arctic. He added that a Government response to the report was currently being drafted and that NERC and the Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (DSIT) had provided input to the response.

e) NERC Executive Chair

Peter Liss informed Council that his appointment as interim Executive Chair was expected to be extended for a period of three months whilst the outcome on the appointment of the substantive NERC Executive Chair was awaited. He added that it was anticipated that the new Executive Chair would attend the March Council meeting in an observer capacity.

[Judith Batchelar left the meeting]

f) NERC Think Big Workshop

Peter Liss informed Council that a Think Big Workshop had taken place in October 2023 which had been well attended and had provided an opportunity for discussion on research themes and opportunities which NERC could be pursuing as well as consideration of the longer-term challenges. The ideas which were generated at the workshop were now being reviewed. Council asked whether the ideas generated were predominantly NERC or UKRI focused and Peter Liss explained that these were new ideas which would assist when putting the case to UKRI for future funding as part of the Spending Review process.

Council commented that it would be important to ensure ideas from universities were captured, noting that one route might be NERC attendance at a meeting of Heads of

Environmental Science departments. There would be opportunities to ask for big ideas from Higher Education Institutions at routine meetings with the NERC Executive Chair and NERC Executive team.

Council asked whether there was an intention to capture ideas from industry and other stakeholders. Susan Waldron informed Council that a series of industry roundtables to capture additional ideas was planned for 2024, but that NERC additionally has an open portal for Big Ideas.

ACTION: link to the NERC Big ideas webpage to be circulated to Council members

g) NERC Impact Awards

Peter Liss expressed his thanks, on behalf of Council, to Hannah Cloke and Charlie McNichol-Fardon who had hosted the NERC Impact Awards which had been very successful. Council commented that the event had been very professionally organised and effectively demonstrated the impact of NERC research including its societal impact. Council expressed its thanks to the NERC team who had organised and supported the event on the day and it was agreed to send a congratulatory note from Council.

ACTION: congratulatory email to be sent from NERC Council to the NERC team who organised the NERC impact award ceremony

h) UKRI Board – Executive – Councils Conference

Peter Liss commented on the recent UKRI Board/Executive/Councils Conference which had taken place at the British Antarctic Survey, Cambridge and had included a tour of the centre. He added that the tour had provided an opportunity to demonstrate the work of NERC and BAS to the UKRI Board and this had been well received.

i) NERC Council recruitment

Peter Liss informed Council that interviews had been held in November to recruit new members to NERC Council and recommendations for appointment were currently being considered by UKRI. He added that the intention was to appoint two new members from April 2024 and that announcements on the new members were expected in January.

Items for discussion

3. Ottoline Leyser (Oral)

3.1 Peter Liss welcomed Professor Dame Ottoline Leyser to NERC Council.

3.2 Ottoline Leyser commented that UKRI was at an important stage in its evolution with a significant change programme in progress which included both major changes in technology and re-organisation across UKRI to maximise expertise with a reduced headcount.

3.3 Ottoline Leyser advised that outcomes from the UKRI strategy were now being realised and had been well received within the community including the UKRI Strategic Themes and the cross-council interdisciplinary response mode scheme.

3.4 Ottoline Leyser informed Council that the current Spending Review period would end on 1 April 2025 and that, given there would be a General Election before the end of January 2025, there was a possibility that a Comprehensive Spending Review might not take place until after the election although UKRI was continuing to plan for it at this stage.

3.5 Council asked how the research councils might improve working with Innovate UK in the future. Ottoline Leyser agreed that it was important that the disciplinary research councils were joined up with both Innovate UK and Research England and added that Innovate UK had recently re-organised its structure around sectors which would help to increase collaboration in the future. She added that the CEO of Innovate UK was leading on

commercialisation across UKRI, working with Executive Chairs.

- 3.6 Council commented that Artificial Intelligence (AI) was a top priority for Government and asked whether NERC should be prioritising AI and if there was anything to be learned from how other councils were utilising it. Ottoline Leyser agreed that it was important for UKRI to consider the opportunities afforded by AI and noted useful areas for NERC to explore the use of new AI techniques would be the substantial long-term data sets on environmental issues and predictive modelling. She added that a pan-UKRI group on AI had been established to capture the many opportunities in an integrated way.
- 3.7 Council asked whether the action UKRI was taking in addressing antisemitism in research institutions was sufficient in light of the current situation in Israel and Gaza. Ottoline Leyser noted that there had been an increased attention on both antisemitism and islamophobia due to the current conflict and commented that universities were working hard to ensure the principles of equality, diversity and inclusion were upheld. She added that UKRI funding came with Terms and Conditions to work within the Equality Act.

Ottoline Leyser informed Council that her response to the open letter from the Secretary of State had emphasised UKRI's commitment to the core principles of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion and to freedom of speech within the law. She added that UKRI was committed to ensuring that those principles were upheld across the research and innovation system.

- 3.8 Council asked how UKRI supported areas of research which might be at risk, such as botany and the plant sciences, given the risk that the UK might become globally uncompetitive if areas at risk were not addressed. Ottoline Leyser commented that there were many examples where research on plants had led to progress in biology and confirmed that work on plant sciences was funded quite broadly across UKRI for that reason. She added that 'orphan' activities were often flagged by individual councils which helped to drive pan-UKRI activity in those areas.
- 3.9 Council noted that the role of 'Champions' as part of the Strategic Priorities Fund had been highly successful in providing an important interface between key stakeholders such as industry, local authorities and schools. It suggested that a similar role for the UKRI Strategic Themes might be equally useful to help implement and communicate UKRI research.
- 3.10 Council asked whether UKRI had a role to play in mitigating the increase in public distrust of scientific research or in addressing recent polarised debates. Ottoline Leyser commented that there was limited evidence of an increase in distrust within the UK but that UKRI did have a leadership role to play in supporting engaged high-quality discussions on key issues.

4. British Geological Survey National Capability Funding (NERC 23/30)

- 4.1 Iain Williams introduced this item. Tom Haynes observed.
- 4.2 Iain Williams advised Council of the three main activities which comprise National Capability: the provision of services, capabilities and facilities for the research community; collection and management of long-term data and modelling for researchers, Government and other users; fundamental and basic applied research. He reminded Council that it had a role in advising on the division of funding for these activities, noting that the British Geological Survey (BGS) differed from the other NERC research centres given its role as a national survey: BGS has its own board; is evaluated differently to other centres and receives the majority of its NC funding to work on national and public good activities.
- 4.3 Iain Williams explained that BGS was proposing changes to its funding to enable it to address some financial challenges and grow and reposition its funding. The main changes proposed by BGS were to shift funding from the areas below into its public good activities by:

- reducing the BGS international budget
 - reducing multi-centre science funding
 - reducing Scientific Support Facilities (S&F)
- 4.4 Iain Williams added that it was anticipated that BGS would continue to grow international activity despite the reduction as this was a particular strength of the centre. He added, however, that the reduction in multi-centre funding and the S&F would have a greater impact both on other centres and the wider research community.
- 4.5 Council expressed some concern over the proposed changes, including the impact on the community. Council remarked that it was difficult to provide comprehensive advice on the proposal based on the information available. Iain Williams explained that the BGS business plan would be agreed by the BGS Board, rather than Council, although he would feedback Council's comments on the proposals and highlight the specific concerns. Council recommended that BGS amend the proposal to maintain the Scientific Support Facilities for the wider community.
- 4.6 Council asked for clarity on the request for NERC support through 'Enabling Change' funding. Council also asked for more information on the proposal to reduce activities delivered from its Public Science Role given the importance of this activity.
- 4.7 David Hannah commented that it would be helpful to consider the proposals in the BGS Business Plan alongside the BGS strategy to ensure there was alignment. Iain Williams explained that the Business Plan was an internal document which had been produced within BGS for approval by its board, noting that activities had been prioritised against the BGS Strategy to inform the Business Plan.
- 4.8 Council cautioned that it would be important for BGS to work within some parameters internationally to reduce the potential for changing the BGS business model.
- 4.9 Nigel Bird confirmed that BGS would not receive any additional funding from NERC despite the increase in costs and BGS was, therefore, required to reduce its activity by 10% which was informing the Business Plan. He added that the BGS Board had reviewed a large number of options before recommending these proposals.
- 5. Strategic Research Investment to achieve NERC Ambitions (NERC 23/31) Slides, item 5**
- 5.1 Susan Waldron introduced this item and presented slides. Sarah Turner observed this item.
- 5.2 Susan Waldron explained that Council was being asked to agree two research programmes for funding from the NERC Strategic Research and Innovation funding line, adding that Science Committee had previously reviewed four investment cases which were ranked in order within the paper.
- 5.3 Susan Waldron outlined the four proposed programmes in rank order:
- Modelling the response of climate and the Earth system to solar radiation management
 - Delivering ecosystem services under changing climatic and societal pressures
 - Harnessing environmental spillover effects to maximise decision making for global sustainability
 - Building resilience to wildfire in a changing climate
- 5.4 Susan Waldron informed Council that it was being asked to confirm that the top two research programmes were suitable for investment now with the remaining two options being considered for future investment.

- 5.5 David Hannah confirmed that Science Committee had considered all investments as viable for strategic investment and provided some additional detail on the discussion held at the Science Committee meeting.

Modelling the response of climate and the Earth system to solar radiation management

- 5.6 Council commented that solar radiation management (SRM) was a controversial topic with potential for reputational damage. Council asked for more information on the breadth of the modelling, for example, whether it included the impact on human health, agriculture, water supply and unintended climate changes. Council agreed, on balance, that it was important to conduct research in this area to assess the possible impact although this would need to be handled carefully to reduce reputational damage. Council highlighted the importance of public engagement in minimising the risk and the potential role of the Royal Society in this.
- 5.7 Council agreed that this was high profile area, noting that a previous project had been conducted in this area, Stratospheric Particle Injection for Climate Engineering (SPICE), which had been co-funded by EPSRC and NERC. In seeking clarification, Council asked whether the investment in this particular area was driven by identifying a research gap or leveraging the UK's existing expertise. David Hannah confirmed that both considerations had been factored into the decision-making process.
- 5.8 Charlie McNichol-Fardon highlighted a recent report on 'Global Tipping Points' which might be a useful mechanism for informing strategic investment.
- 5.9 Susan Waldron advised Council that lessons learned from the SPICE activity had helped to inform UKRI's trusted research and innovation policy. She added that it would be important for the UK to invest in this area given the international interest, noting that effective engagement with stakeholders would be key.
- 5.10 In summary, Peter Liss outlined the importance of this research, noting that it was being done in a controlled way using computer modelling. It was agreed to fund this proposal, noting there remained some concerns.
ACTION: Council agreed to fund the proposal 'Modelling the response of climate and the Earth system to solar radiation management'

Delivering ecosystem services under changing climatic and societal pressures

- 5.11 Council queried whether the focus on 'the UK's natural and semi-natural ecosystems in terrestrial, freshwater and land-sea transitional environments' was sufficiently broad and included really novel landscapes. Susan Waldron explained that a decision had been taken to exclude certain ecosystems, such as urban environments, as they were heavily managed and others, such as agricultural landscapes, were being covered under the Building a Green Future theme.
- 5.12 David Hannah added that there had been a recent Highlight Topic on the urban environment which had been taken into account when formulating this proposal.
- 5.13 Council asked for consideration to be given to the wording of this investment to ensure that some novel new landscapes in urban environments, particularly related to biodiversity, were not excluded.
- 5.14 Council agreed to fund this proposal.
ACTION: Council agreed to fund the proposal 'Delivering ecosystem services under changing climatic and societal pressures'
- 5.15 In summary, Peter Liss confirmed that the remaining two ideas would be retained for

consideration for future funding opportunities.

6. Planning for His Majesty's Government Comprehensive Spending Review (NERC 23/32)

- 6.1 Alison Robinson introduced this item and Kate Hamer observed.
- 6.2 Alison Robinson advised Council that NERC was beginning to prepare for the next Spending Review (SR), noting that the current SR would run until the end of the 2024/25 financial year, and the timing for the next review was currently uncertain. She confirmed that UKRI would lead on a co-ordinated pan-UKRI Spending Review approach with a second stage that would set allocations for individual research councils and any cross-cutting initiatives. Alison Robinson also noted that NERC would be preparing a case for the Antarctic Logistics and Infrastructure (ALI) budget as well as the NERC core budget.
- 6.3 Alison Robinson highlighted that, given the uncertainty on timing and the approach of a General Election, there was a possibility that the Spending Review process could result in a one-year rollover allocation rather than a typical three-to-five-year settlement adding that NERC was preparing for a range of possible scenarios.
- 6.4 Council asked whether the revised date for Council retreat would result in the SR discussion at Council being delayed. Alison Robinson informed Council that a further discussion would take place at March Council.
- 6.5 Council highlighted the importance of conducting an international comparison as part of the planning for the Spending Review and suggested that it would also be worthwhile to consider updating the infrastructure roadmap. Council emphasised the importance of making a case for investment in science by promoting the societal impact of NERC research. Alison Robinson acknowledged these considerations and expressed her commitment to exploring how these aspects could be integrated into the overarching UKRI framework.

7. Future Marine Research Infrastructure (FMRI) (Oral) Slides, item 7

- 7.1 Iain Williams introduced this item and presented slides. Chloe Somers observed this item.
- 7.2 Iain Williams explained that this programme had formally started around six months ago and had been initiated by a report commissioned by NERC and undertaken by the National Oceanography Centre entitled 'NZOC: Net Zero Oceanographic Capability.' He added that, since the report, trials had taken place using hydrotreated vegetable oil (HVO) to reduce CO₂ emissions on the NERC ships.
- 7.3 Iain Williams added that the programme had three main objectives:
 - to establish an environmentally and economically sustainable marine observation and experimentation infrastructure for current and future research
 - to establish a marine infrastructure portfolio that leads using innovations in measurement and platforms to push the frontiers of marine science
 - to develop an approach that is outward looking and offers global leadership, collaboration opportunities and opens access to under-represented groups
- 7.4 Iain Williams advised Council that the RRS *James Cook* is planned to remain in operation until approximately 2030 and NERC would need to take a decision on if, and how, to replace this capability. He added that NERC had substantially invested in marine autonomy in recent years, which would be a consideration in deciding what future infrastructure options might be needed, confirming that no decisions had yet been taken.

- 7.5 In response to a question from Council, Iain Williams confirmed that Marine Research Infrastructure included a broad range of scientific activities undertaken at sea, which encompassed the seabed, subsurface geology and atmospheric science.
- 7.6 Council highlighted the importance of examining which areas of research would be impacted by any reduction in ship capacity and to consider how to mitigate this.
- 7.7 Council commented that ship technology was evolving quickly and asked how NERC would consider what future technology might be available. Iain Williams confirmed that this would be monitored closely by the NERC Major Projects team, with Nigel Bird noting that engagement with Innovate UK was also taking place.
- 7.8 In summary, Peter Liss highlighted the importance of continuing to engage with European counterparts on future opportunities to work together, such as the sharing of capability.

8. Progressing the UKRI compute landscape (Oral) Slides, item 8

- 8.1 Iain Williams introduced this item and presented slides. Anna Angus-Smyth observed this item.
- 8.2 Iain Williams explained that this item provided an update to Council on how NERC was responding to recent Government announcements on investments in Artificial Intelligence and Exascale computing.
- 8.3 Iain Williams reminded Council that NERC had published its Digital Strategy in May 2022. He added that NERC's compute portfolio, which included JASMIN, Monsoon2, Archer2 was evolving and explained that the UKRI and UK compute portfolio included AI Research Resource and investment in a UK exascale system.

[Judith Batchelar re-joined the meeting]

- 8.4 Iain Williams explained that this was a transition from NERC leading investments in digital infrastructure specifically for the environmental science community to some of these investments being made at a UKRI level, noting that NERC had a role to play in ensuring the environmental community was prepared for these changes.
- 8.5 Iain Williams informed the Council that NERC was leading on skills development on behalf of UKRI, with a £9 million investment to support digital skills and career pathways. It was noted that NERC's digital advisory committees had highlighted growing digital skills as a high priority.
- 8.6 Council asked whether quantum computing was included in the NERC portfolio. Iain Williams responded that there was one current investment on quantum sensors with EPSRC.
- 8.7 Council asked whether there was any information on the costs involved for the transition. Iain Williams confirmed that transitioning current models, such as UK ESM, into exascale models would be needed and there would be a future discussion on how this might be funded.
- 8.8 Council highlighted the importance of future proofing any decisions to optimise value for money. Iain Williams concurred and commented that the work on the compute landscape across UKRI would help ensure there was a joined-up approach.
- 8.9 Council highlighted that the Digital Catapult had launched a BridgeAI programme, led by the Alan Turing Institute, which was bringing academic and business communities together. The programme included a focus on skills which might provide some synergy in terms of

the upskilling required for AI technologies.

8.10 Council commented on the importance of ensuring data sets were capable of being shared across disciplines. Iain Williams confirmed that a trial was currently taking place as part of the Digital Solutions programme.

8.11 Council asked what consideration was being given to cloud computing. Anna Angus-Smyth confirmed that this would be part of the consideration on future need and informed Council that NERC was part of a pilot on research data cloud solutions being led by DSIT.

8.12 Council asked whether cyber security was also being considered and Iain Williams agreed it was an important consideration and was part of the foundational areas being led by councils.

9. NERC Ways of Working (Oral) Slide, item 9

9.1 Nigel Bird introduced this item and presented a slide to illustrate some recent outcomes as a result of the NERC Ways of Working programme.

9.2 Nigel Bird informed Council that it had been decided to review NERC's internal corporate governance structure with the result that:

- the NERC Advisory Network would cease in December 2023
- Science Committee would reduce its meetings from four to three each year

9.3 Susan Waldron explained that the NERC Advisory Network had been under-utilised, particularly during the pandemic, and expert advice on areas, such as Talent and Skills, might be usefully drawn in future from Science Committee or from the wider community.

9.4 David Hannah added that it was important to ensure that meetings were purposeful and that business was clearly linked to both the NERC Strategic Delivery Plan and the Science Committee Terms of Reference.

9.5 Council was content with the changes proposed.

9.6 Council asked whether there was more to be done to ensure that the Future Leaders Council (FLC) was receiving sufficient support from NERC Council, adding that it would be important to consider ideas from FLC in the planning stages for the NERC Council Retreat. Charlie McNichol-Fardon commented that the FLC had discussed interaction with NERC Council at the meeting in November as part of an activity on action learning sets. She added that the FLC was keen to have more interaction with NERC Council on an informal basis, noting that NERC Council members attendance at FLC in a mentoring capacity was really useful.

10. Agenda and unconfirmed minutes of the NERC Assurance Board (NERC 23/33)

10.1 Rashik Parmar introduced this item to update Council on the NERC Assurance Board (NAB) meeting held on 24 October 2023, which was the first meeting he had chaired.

10.2 Rashik Parmar highlighted the items for discussion at the recent meeting which had included: risk management; NERC Head Office Capability Review; NERC-BAS Operations and Safety Assurance and Advisory Group (NBOSAAG) annual report.

10.3 Rashik Parmar informed Council that NAB had a rolling programme of topics for discussion and invited Council members to get in touch if there were any items which it felt it would be helpful for NAB to discuss.

11. Agenda and unconfirmed minutes of Science Committee (NERC 23/34)

- 11.1 David Hannah introduced this item to update Council on the Science Committee meeting held on 18 and 19 October 2023 at the UK Met Office. He added that two new members had attended their first meeting and noted that five members were due to demit shortly and expressed his thanks for their valuable contribution.
- 11.2 David Hannah informed Council that the items for discussion at the last meeting included: the annual review of Science Committee activity and Terms of Reference; Highlight Topics; Strategic Research Investments; NERC's Digital Ambitions.
- 11.3 David Hannah informed Council that the next meeting of Science Committee would take place in January 2024 at the University of Birmingham with five new members due to attend. He added that the items for discussion would include: the UKRI Strategic Themes; Equality, Diversity and Inclusion positive action; Strategic Research Investments; outcome of Science Committee's annual self-assessment review.
- 11.4 David Hannah invited Council to agree that the Terms of Reference for Science Committee continued to be fit for purpose, asking it to note a minor change which was to consider geographical diversity when recruiting new members for Science Committee in future. Council was content with both the Terms of Reference and the minor addition.

12. Agenda of the Future Leaders Council (NERC 23/35)

- 12.1 Charlie McNichol-Fardon introduced this item to provide an update on the second meeting of the Future Leaders Council (FLC) held at the National Oceanography Centre in November.
- 12.2 Charlie McNichol-Fardon explained that the FLC had discussed the following items: facilitated action learning sets which had included three elements (personal, advocacy, governance); NERC Council Dashboard; approach to estate decarbonisation; annual report outline; NERC Public Engagement Strategy; NERC digital strategy. She added that future items for discussion included the net zero pathway to implementation and decarbonisation; the FLC annual report; BAS future fellowships; biodiversity targets.
- 12.3 Charlie McNichol-Fardon added that a Diversity and Inclusion sub-group had been established which would consider future role modelling schemes.

13. Rolling programme of business (NERC 23/26)

- 13.1 Helen Page reminded Council members that this item provided an opportunity to raise items for discussion at future Council meetings and that items for discussion might also be submitted to her at any point.
- 13.2 Helen Page highlighted the proposed locations of meetings for 2024 and the proposed meeting dates for 2025.

14. Any Other Business (Oral)

- 14.1 Council raised a query on how to provide feedback on the information contained with the NERC Council Dashboard. Nigel Bird confirmed that any queries could now be sent to Mary Goodchild who leads on this activity.