

TfSE Partnership Board
27 October 2025 – 14:00-17:00
Minutes - draft
ICE, Council Room

Partnership Board Members

Cllr Keith Glazier (Chair) Leader East Sussex County Council	Cllr Simon Curry (Vice Chair) Cabinet Member, Climate Change and Strategic Regeneration Medway Council	Cllr Trevor Muten Cabinet Member for Transport, Parking and Public Realm Brighton & Hove City Council
Cllr John Ennis Lead Councillor for Climate Strategy and Transport Reading Borough Council (representing BLTB)	Cllr Paul Fuller Justice of the Peace Isle of Wight Council	Cllr Kirsty North Representing Hampshire County Council
Cllr Matt Furniss Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure Surrey County Council	Cllr Joy Dennis Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport West Sussex County Council	Geoff French CBE Chair Transport Forum
Mark Potter Deputy Chair SDNPA Representing protected landscapes	James Craig Lead Strategic Planner Network Rail	Cllr Christie Lambert Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Transport Southampton City Council
Shamal Ratnayaka Aviation Strategy Lead Transport for London		

Apologies:

- Cllr Peter Osborne, Kent County Council
- Cllr Peter Candlish, Portsmouth City Council
- Cllr Lulu Bowerman, Hampshire County Council
- Cllr Matt Boughton, District and Borough representative
- Cllr Sophie Cox, District and Borough representative
- Dave Hooper, Network Rail
- Richard Leonard, National Highways
- Daniel Ruiz, Business Representative
- Vince Lucas, Business Representative
- Dan Taylor, DfT

Officers attended:

- Rupert Clubb, Transport for the South East

- Sarah Valentine, Transport for the South East
- Mark Valleley, Transport for the South East
- Keir Wilkins, Transport for the South East
- Emily Bailey, Transport for the South East
- Joshua Jiao, Transport for the South East
- James Boyes, Transport for the South East
- Jaimie McSorley, Transport for the South East
- Eleanor Jewell, Transport for the South East

Item	Action
1. Welcome and Apologies	
1.1 Councillor Keith Glazier (KG) welcomed Members to the meeting and noted apologies.	
1.2 Apologies were received from Cllr Osborne, Cllr Candlish, Cllr Lulu Bowerman, Cllr Matt Boughton, Cllr Sophie Cox, Dave Hooper, Richard Leonard, Daniel Ruiz, Vince Lucas.	
1.3 KG welcomed Cllr Kirsty North attending as a substitute for Cllr Lulu Bowerman, representing Hampshire.	
1.4 KG welcomed Shamal Ratnayaka joining the Partnership Board representing Transport for London.	
1.5 KG welcomed James Craig, attending as a substitute for Dave Hooper, representing Network Rail.	
1.6 KG reminded Members that the Government had set out its position on future funding for TfSE in a letter, which was sent to Members on 8 September.	
1.7 KG introduced Rupert Clubb (RC), who provided context for the restricted item at the end of the meeting, noting that this is confidential.	
1.8 KG updated the Board on a recent meeting with DfT Director General, Conrad Bailey, alongside other Board Members, where Members shared their views on the DfT decision.	
1.9 KG introduced Peter Duggan (PD), who provided an update on behalf of DfT. PD emphasised that the recent announcement does not reflect on the work of TfSE. The key decision is that local authorities will now receive all revenue funding. DfT confirmed it will continue to engage with TfSE, provide a funding allocation for 2026/27, and give due regard to TfSE's work.	
2. Minutes from last meeting	
2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.	

3. Declarations of Interest	
3.1 Cllr Glazier asked Board Members to declare any interests they may have in relation to the agenda. No interests were declared.	
4. Statements from the public	
4.1 Cllr Glazier confirmed that no statements from the public have been made.	
5. Transport Strategy Refresh	
5.1 KG noted that the constitution sets out that a decision on the Transport Strategy requires a super majority decision. RC confirmed that a super majority was present at the meeting.	
5.2 Mark Valleley (MV) introduced the item. The objective today is to ask the Board to agree the final version of the transport strategy.	
5.3 At the Partnership Board in July, the Board agreed the draft final version of the strategy, which had feedback from the consultation period incorporated. Following the meeting, four authorities (The Isle of Wight Council, Kent County Council, Portsmouth City Council and Hampshire County Council) wished to seek approval for the draft final version.	
5.4 Since this meeting, The Isle of Wight Council, Portsmouth City Council and Hampshire County Council have approved the draft final version.	
5.5 On 9 September the draft final Transport Strategy was taken to Kent's Environment, Transport Cabinet Committee, where they agreed to make a recommendation to the Leader to endorse the Strategy. This decision is still to be taken and once a decision is taken it will be subject to the call in period for scrutiny.	
5.6 Following the July Partnership meeting, a final proofread of the strategy document was undertaken and small amendments were made, which do not affect its substance, intent, or conclusions. The Integrated Sustainability Agreement (ISA) that sits alongside the Transport Strategy was agreed at the July meeting.	
5.7 If the strategy is agreed today, a communications and engagement plan has been prepared. A summary document has been produced, which can be used to promote the strategy.	
5.8 Cllr Simon Curry (SC) noted the importance of using accurate maps, and for this to be reflected developing the Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) refresh as there was one scheme in Medway shown on one of the maps that is no longer being pursued.	

<p>5.9 Cllr Paul Fuller (PF) noted that the Transport Strategy was endorsed at the Isle of Wight council meeting, and while they agreed to support it, Isle of Wight Members felt TfSE could be bolder and go further.</p> <p>5.10 Cllr Trevor Muten (TM) emphasised the importance of ensuring the Transport Strategy and SIP are closely aligned with local authorities' Local Transport Plans (LTPs) and any future plans developed by Mayoral Combined Authorities (MCAs). KG noted that while MCAs will take time to develop their own regional transport plans, having an overarching TfSE Transport Strategy in place is both supportive and beneficial in the interim.</p> <p>5.11 The recommendations were agreed by a super majority of the Partnership Board, meaning the Transport Strategy is adopted as TfSE's strategic advice to Government.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The Members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Note the outcomes of the approval processes pursued by the Isle of Wight Council, Kent County Council, Portsmouth City Council, Hampshire County Council to agree the transport strategy, and; (2) Agree the final version of the transport strategy. 	
<h2>6. Regional Travel Survey</h2> <p>6.1 Sarah Valentine (SV) introduced the item, providing context to the Regional Travel Survey (RTS), outlining how it is already being used to inform TfSE workstreams.</p> <p>6.2 SV noted that TfSE is working with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) to provide detailed data analysis to support their local transport plans and welcomed the opportunity to extend this service to other local transport authorities.</p> <p>6.3 SV introduced Joshua Jiao (JJ), who presented the RTS approach and highlighted key findings for the region. JJ confirmed that the data and accompanying dashboards will be shared with officers via the TfSE Centre of Excellence, alongside a launch webinar on 7 November.</p> <p>6.4 JJ noted that TfSE will explore collaboration opportunities with the Department for Transport (DfT) and universities, including the potential use of DfT's synthetic population tool.</p> <p>6.5 To ensure data reliability, TfSE will monitor behavioural changes over time, with the intention (subject to Board approval) for the survey to be conducted biennially.</p> <p>6.6 Councillor Trevor Muten (TM) queried whether the RTS sufficiently captured responses from younger demographics. JJ acknowledged that initial responses were limited in this group but confirmed that targeted engagement was undertaken to address and rectify this.</p>	

6.7 TM asked whether walking within urban areas is adequately reflected in the assessment. JJ confirmed that it is, explaining that the survey captures details of all trips made by respondent, including mode of travel, thereby ensuring walking is represented alongside other modes.

6.8 TM queried whether mobile network data being procured could be integrated with the RTS to strengthen data collection. JJ confirmed that this data will be combined.

6.9 TM asked how the RTS data could be used to encourage modal shift. JJ noted that the findings will be used to highlight opportunities for behavioural change.

6.10 The recommendation was **agreed** by the Partnership Board.

RECOMMENDATION:

The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to comment on the Regional Travel Survey and endorse the proposed next steps.

7. State of the Region

7.1 SV introduced this item, noting that this is the second State of the Region report, following the inaugural publication in 2023.

7.2 The 2025 report was presented, with SV highlighting key findings including the continued uptake of electric vehicles (EVs) across the region and the ongoing challenges around public transport accessibility in rural areas.

7.3 Cllr Simon Curry (SC) welcomed the report and the valuable data it provides.

7.4 Cllr Paul Fuller (PF) queried the inclusion of Heathrow as an international airport, given its location outside of the TfSE, noting that other nearby international airports such as Bournemouth is used frequently by residents, but not referenced. They should be considered in future iterations of the report.

7.5 Cllr John Ennis (JE) drew attention to the drop in bus and rail patronage and highlighted the challenges of fare prices in being able to improve those numbers.

7.6 Councillor Joy Dennis (JD) suggested reviewing the impacts of the Bus Service Improvement Plans (BSIPs) on Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) in rural areas, to understand if demand matches assumptions.

7.7 The recommendation was **agreed** by the Partnership Board.

RECOMMENDATION:

The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to agree the 2025 State of the Region Report and agree to its publication on the TfSE website.

8. Intermodal Rail Freight Interchange Study	
8.1 Mark Valleley (MV) provided an outline of the Intermodal Rail Freight Interchange Study to the Partnership Board.	
8.2 The study identified opportunities for both expansion and new infrastructure essential to supporting the shift of freight from road to rail and meeting the Government's target of achieving 75% growth in rail freight by 2050. This work builds on the priorities established through TfSE's Freight, Logistics and Gateways Strategy.	
8.3 The report outlined several challenges, including limited land availability for infrastructure, the complexity of planning processes, and a lack of local authority awareness regarding the need for freight interchange facilities.	
8.4 Key recommendations included ensuring the importance of rail freight interchanges is reflected in local authority plans and accelerating planning processes. TfSE is to consider hosting a stakeholder roundtable to develop an action plan for progressing these recommendations. Additionally, there is a need for TfSE to work with government to raise the profile of these facilities and secure their recognition as critical national infrastructure.	
8.5 Mark Potter (MP) welcomed the potential benefits around decarbonisation, accessibility, and local investment but expressed concern that the previous study did not sufficiently consider protected landscapes. He noted that many areas identified as lacking infrastructure are within such landscapes and cautioned against the use of permitted development rights, which could bypass planning safeguards. MP requested further engagement on how potential impacts could be mitigated.	
8.6 Cllr Trevor Muten (TM) welcomed the report but raised concerns about rail capacity constraints in Sussex and questioned how the strategy accounts for freight movement from ports given these limitations. MV explained that this study focused specifically on interchanges, and wider capacity issues would be addressed through the forthcoming Rail Strategy.	
8.7 Cllr Kirsty North (KN) welcomed Andover's ranking as sixth in terms of potential interchange development and suggested further engagement with local officers to support this opportunity.	
8.8 Cllr Joy Dennis (JD) highlighted the need for Croydon Junction area pinch point to be addressed, echoing Cllr Muten's comments on capacity and emphasising the importance of addressing this during future development work.	
8.9 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.	
<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <p>The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Note the findings and conclusions of the Intermodal Rail Freight Interchange Study; and, (2) Agree the study report, recommendations and next steps. 	

9. Audit and Governance Committee	
<p>9.1 Cllr Joy Dennis (JD) provided Members with an update on the Audit and Governance Committee meeting held on 25 September and thanked those who attended.</p> <p>9.2 JD reported that the Department for Transport (DfT) letter had been discussed at the meeting and noted that it would be addressed further under the restricted item on today's agenda.</p> <p>9.3 JD highlighted early considerations regarding potential changes to the TfSE Constitution and Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA), noting that a review may be required in light of devolution and local government reorganisation. JD emphasised the importance of maintaining flexibility given that no formal decisions have yet been made. Any proposed amendments will be brought to a future Partnership Board meeting for consideration.</p> <p>9.4 JD outlined the outcome of the recent audit of TfSE, which received a rating of reasonable assurance. The two recommendations arising from the audit have already been implemented.</p> <p>9.5 JD also provided an overview of the updated risk register, noting several amendments made following the DfT announcement. The revised version will be presented at the January Partnership Board meeting.</p> <p>9.6 The Committee also reviewed TfSE's financial position, assigning confidence ratings to each budget line; this will be detailed further under the finance item.</p> <p>9.7 KG thanked the Committee for their work.</p> <p>9.8 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board</p>	
RECOMMENDATION: The Members of the Partnership Board are recommended to comment on the discussions and actions arising at the meeting of the Audit and Governance Committee.	
10. Finance Update	
<p>10.1 Keir Wilkins (KW) provided an update on TfSE's financial position to the end of quarter two for 2025/26.</p> <p>10.2 KW reported that expenditure stood at just under £1 million to the end of September, which is in line with expectations. Funding is forecast to increase over the remainder of the year as payments are made upon completion of work. These figures have been reviewed and scrutinised by the Audit and Governance Committee.</p> <p>10.3 KW also provided TfSE's forecast expenditure to the end of the financial year, noting that these forecasts have been amended following the</p>	

<p>completion of final scoping work. Cost savings against the budget are being provided, particularly through work that will be delivered by the Centre of Excellence.</p>	
<p>10.4 The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p>	
<p>RECOMMENDATION: The Members of the Partnership Board are recommended to consider and approve the methodology and plan for the periodic update of the SIP.</p>	
<p>11. Responses to Consultations</p>	
<p>11.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) provided an overview of the three consultation responses submitted by TfSE.</p> <p>11.2 Cllr Matt Furniss (MF) raised a concern regarding the response to the House of Commons Transport Committee Inquiry – Joined-up journeys: achieving and measuring transport integration, particularly its references to Greater Manchester, which uses a franchising model. MF noted that this should not be cited as an example of best practice, as Enhanced Partnerships currently work well and franchising should not be imposed on local authorities as a result of the inquiry. RC acknowledged that franchising is not a suitable model for all areas and recognised both the benefits of Enhanced Partnerships and the potential opportunities franchising could bring to some urban settings. RC agreed to amend the consultation response to reflect this discussion.</p> <p>11.3 Cllr Joy Dennis (JD) asked about behaviour change referenced in the same inquiry, including how it would be achieved and within what timescales. RC noted that it would be for the Transport Committee to draw conclusions based on the evidence submitted.</p> <p>11.4 JD also queried the response to the South Downs National Park Partnership Management Plan Consultation, particularly around rural bus services. JD suggested distinguishing between leisure trips through the park and journeys made by residents. RC acknowledged that transport corridors through national parks present unique challenges and welcomed discussion on how to reflect this in the response, referencing the opportunities provided by the Regional Travel Survey and mobile network data. Mark Potter (MP) noted the difficulties in disaggregating such data.</p> <p>11.5 Cllr John Ennis (JE) highlighted recent discussions in Reading, which showed that increased leisure travel has contributed to higher private vehicle use. RC agreed, noting that travel patterns are changing and that the Regional Travel Survey and mobile network data will be valuable in informing future discussions.</p> <p>11.6 Cllr Paul Fuller (PF) observed that much of the recent growth in bus patronage has been among passengers over 60. Rupert Clubb (RC) provided an overview of the three consultation responses we have responded to.</p> <p>11.7 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p>	<p>Amendment to the HoC inquiry consultation response – remove reference to Greater Manchester.</p>

<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <p>The Members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Agree the draft response to consultation on the Draft South Downs National Park Partnership Management Plan 2026–31; (2) Agree the draft response to the Isle of Wight Council's Consultation on the Draft Island Transport Plan 4; and (3) Agree the draft response to House of Commons Transport Committee Inquiry - “Joined-up journeys: achieving and measuring transport integration” 	
<p>12. Analytical Framework</p> <p>12.1 Sarah Valentine (SV) provided an update on the progress of the analytical tools and officer support being developed across the TfSE region. SV emphasised the value this workstream is delivering to local authority officers, particularly when the data, tools and models are considered collectively.</p> <p>12.2 SV reported that procurement is underway for mobile network data and freight data, both identified by local authority officers as priority areas.</p> <p>12.3 These datasets will provide substantial benefits to TfSE workstreams and support both existing and new local authorities.</p> <p>12.4 SV noted that housing and employment data is also being collated across the region, creating a single, reliable evidence base</p> <p>12.5 Progress continues on the suite of analytical tools. The South East Highways Assignment Model (SEHAM) was identified as a previous modelling gap, and TfSE will work closely with National Highways as they update their regional transport models, sharing data and lessons learned. SV also highlighted the procurement of Podaris, a modelling and scenario planning tool that TfSE will be able to offer to local authorities at a discounted rate.</p> <p>12.6 A review of the Major Road Network (MRN) undertaken by the Department for Transport (DfT) required input from local officers; TfSE provided support using these analytical tools to inform responses.</p> <p>12.7 SV also noted the technical expertise provided to Wokingham Borough Council, helping the authority strengthen its role as an intelligent client in the work it commissions.</p> <p>12.8 Cllr John Ennis (JE) welcomed the update and highlighted the benefits already being realised in Berkshire through the analytical framework.</p> <p>12.9 The recommendation was noted by the Partnership Board.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION:</p>	

<p>The Members of the Partnership Board are recommended to comment on the progress with the development of an analytical framework.</p>	
<p>13. Business Advisory Group</p>	
<p>13.1 Keir Wilkins (KW) conveyed apologies on behalf of Vince Lucas and Daniel Ruiz, Co-Chairs of the Business Advisory Group, who were unable to attend the meeting.</p> <p>13.2 KW provided an update on the most recent Business Advisory Group meeting, which was held virtually on 1 October. He reported a strong appetite for organising a second Business Summit, building on the success and positive feedback from the inaugural event held earlier this year.</p> <p>13.3 Cllr Joy Dennis (JD) suggested undertaking a review of the Group's membership. The SIP Refresh Task and Finish Group wanted the SIP to engage with a range of businesses including freight operators and energy infrastructure providers and enquired whether these types of companies were included. KG agreed that officers would pass this feedback on to Daniel Ruiz and Vince Lucas in their capacity as Co-Chairs.</p> <p>13.4 The recommendation was noted by the Partnership Board.</p>	
<p>RECOMMENDATION: The Members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the progress of the Business Advisory Group.</p>	
<p>14. Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) refresh</p>	
<p>14.1 Sarah Valentine (SV) provided an update on the refresh of the Strategic Investment Plan (SIP).</p> <p>14.2 SV highlighted the establishment of a task and finish group comprising officers and Members, tasked with providing high-level strategic direction and advice on engagement with government. The focus of today's meeting was on the process of sifting and assessing schemes and exploring financing options. SV thanked attendees for their input, noting that the outcomes will be reported back to officers.</p> <p>14.3 The Member Task and Finish Group had recommended that the draft SIP could be considered at an informal Board meeting in December.</p> <p>14.4 The final SIP is scheduled to be presented to the Partnership Board in March 2026, ahead of the establishment of Mayoral Combined Authorities (MCAs).</p> <p>14.4 The recommendation was noted by the Partnership Board.</p>	
<p>RECOMMENDATION: The Members of the Partnership Board are recommended to comment on the progress of the Strategic Investment Plan Refresh.</p>	

15. Delivering the SIP	
<p>15.1 Sarah Valentine (SV) provided an update on the delivery of business case development support across the TfSE region that supports the delivery of the SIP.</p> <p>15.2 SV noted that over the past three financial years, more than £800,000 has been provided to local authorities to develop business cases and build a pipeline of schemes, highlighting the value this has delivered for regional transport planning.</p> <p>15.3 SV highlighted TfSE's role as project manager for the Kent to Gatwick scheme, supporting authorities that lack the capacity to manage such projects. Additional funding from Gatwick Airport was also leveraged to enhance delivery.</p> <p>15.4 SV emphasised the benefits of convening scheme promoters across the region, which has allowed for common challenges to be identified and addressed collectively, rather than on an individual scheme basis. Key challenges identified include long timescales for DfT review of business cases, which TfSE continues to advocate on behalf of the region.</p> <p>15.5 SV also provided an update on the Road Investment Strategy (RIS3) published by National Highways on 26 August, noting that no funding is currently planned for scheme development in the next RIS period. SV highlighted the importance of addressing issues from previously cancelled schemes, ensuring problems are resolved even if the named scheme is no longer progressing.</p> <p>15.6 The recommendation was noted by the Partnership Board.</p>	
<p>RECOMMENDATION:</p> <p>The Members of the Partnership Board are recommended to comment on the progress of a range of workstreams that support the delivery of the Strategic Investment Plan.</p>	
16. Technical Programme Update	
<p>16.1 Mark Valleley (MV) provided an update on the technical programme workstreams.</p> <p>16.2 MV emphasised ongoing work on the Rail Strategy, which is scheduled to be presented to the Partnership Board in January.</p> <p>16.3 Cllr Simon Curry (SC) queried the EV Charging Strategy, noting increasing demand from businesses in Medway and the resulting pressures faced by local authorities. JD supported this point, highlighting that these pressures are a key constraint.</p> <p>16.4 Cllr Trevor Muten (TM) emphasised that capacity is fundamental and that the rollout of EV charging should drive this forward. He noted that grid</p>	

<p>capacity is critical and needs to be communicated to the relevant department.</p> <p>16.5 JD further noted that on-street charging is not a major issue, but challenges exist in commercial environments.</p> <p>16.6 The recommendations were noted by the Partnership Board.</p>	
<p>RECOMMENDATION:</p> <p>The Members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Comment on progress with the work to implement the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy; (2) Comment on the progress with the delivery of the Freight, Logistics and Gateways Strategy; (3) Comment on the progress with the work on rail; (4) Comment on the progress with the work on decarbonisation. 	
<p>17. Centre of Excellence Update</p> <p>17.1 Emily Bailey (EB) provided an update on the progress of the TfSE Centre of Excellence since the last Partnership Board meeting.</p> <p>17.2 EB highlighted recent activities and outlined forthcoming initiatives. EB also presented the monitoring and evaluation results for the period from June to September. Key takeaways include the increase in usage particularly in September where we saw over 300 visits to the site, with the Carbon Assessment Playbook continuing to be the most visited page.</p> <p>17.3 Chat Forum uptake is also on the increase, and the interactions from local authorities highlight their interest and commitment to knowledge sharing.</p> <p>17.4 Uptake of webinars since July has been high, suggesting content relevance, especially given its timing during the summer months. Forthcoming activity was highlighted for Members.</p> <p>17.5 Cllr Joy Dennis (JD) praised the increased usage of the Centre of Excellence and noted that she expects the Centre of Excellence to become a key part of TfSE activity in the future, especially following the creation of Mayoral Combined Authorities.</p> <p>The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p>	
<p>RECOMMENDATION:</p> <p>The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to comment on the progress being made with the delivery of the Centre of Excellence.</p>	
<p>18. Advisory Panel and Transport Forum Update</p> <p>18.1 Geoff French (GF) provided an update on the Advisory Panel and Transport Forum.</p> <p>18.2 GF outlined the current composition of the Advisory Panel and noted the need for the panel to evolve to meet future requirements.</p>	

<p>18.3 The recommendation was noted by the Partnership Board.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the recent work of the Transport Forum and Advisory Panel.</p>	
<p>19. Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Update</p>	
<p>19.1 James Boyes (JB) provided an update on communications and engagement activity since the last Partnership Board meeting.</p> <p>19.2 JB noted that, following the Board's decision to adopt the Transport Strategy, planned communications will commence to raise awareness of the strategy, missions, and TfSE's role in helping to deliver them.</p> <p>19.3 Cllr Joy Dennis (JD) requested that future updates include statistics on social media metrics, which JB agreed to provide.</p> <p>19.4 The recommendation was noted by the Partnership Board.</p>	
<p>RECOMMENDATION: The Members of the Partnership Board are recommended to comment on the communications and engagement activity that has been undertaken since the last Board meeting.</p>	
<p>20. AOB</p>	
<p>20.1 No matters were raised.</p>	
<p>21. Date of Next Meeting</p>	
<p>21.1 KG noted that the next meeting will take place <u>Thursday 29 January</u>, 14:00-17:00 in person at ICE.</p> <p>There will be an extraordinary Board meeting held on 15 December, pending discussions at the private item.</p>	