

## Minutes

In attendance:

Lee Cain (LC)	Keltbray
Jon Christie (JC)	Martello Piling
Nick Dewey (ND)	Rock and Alluvium
Joseph Forsyth (JF)	JRL Civil Engineering
Susan Gardiner (SG)	Cementation Skanska
Robert Gold	Bachy Soletanche
Dan Hatcher (DH)	Bauer
Phil Hines (PH)	Bachy Soletanche
Simon Jones (SJ)	Keller
Peter Kerr	DAWSON-WAM
Mark Lee (ML)	Abi Eqp
Gary Levers (GL)	Van Elle
Malcolm Mearns (MM)	Bachy Soletanche
Colin Newman (CN)	Central Piling
Richard Nicholls (RN)	Expanded
Adrian O'Rourke (AO)	FK Lowry
Hugh Sloan (HS)	RBL
Paul Smith (PS)	RBL
Robert Speakman (RS) (Chair)	Aarsleff
Alan Turner (AT)	Martello Piling
Colin Williams (CW)	BBGE

Present:

Ciaran Jennings (CJ)	FPS Secretariat
Isabel Jennings (IJ)	FPS Secretariat
Melissa Bramley (MB)	FPS Secretariat

No.	Topic	
1.	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Andrew Davison - Keller, Brian Watson – Bauer, Dan Hutchings – Martello, Shaun Davison – Keller, David Palmer – Dawson WAM</p>	
2.	<p><b>Approval of the Minutes of the meeting held on the 18<sup>th</sup> May 2020</b></p> <p>RS stated the minutes were a true account of the previous meeting seconded by SJ.</p> <p>Cage Supplier Memberships – CJ to discuss with PH. CJ stated further auditors are required. The benchmark audit can now take place post COVID peak</p> <p>RS requested items from the Action List to be integrated onto the Agenda for future meetings. The Action list from the previous meeting was reviewed.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Matters Arising (not covered elsewhere)</b></p> <p><b>Appointing new committee chair/co-chair:</b> An announcement will be made in relation to the appointment of the new committee chair / co-chair Announcement by the end of the week commencing 2<sup>nd</sup> October.</p>	FPS Secretariat

	<p><b>Piling Supervisor’s Site Safety Training Scheme (PSSSTS)</b> –An FPS developed piling specific course. CJ asked members to forward names of candidates who need to complete a refresher course – to enable FPS to organise the next course.</p> <p><b>FPS Audit</b> – CJ stated now is an opportune time to review the audit schedules with the aim of updating the schedules to streamline and include Occupational Health, D&amp;A policies, and Mental Health provisions. A further aim is to continually promote the quality of FPS Members vs non-Members, including quality standards FPS members can meet, and also by continually improving and raising standards. CJ stated a task group needs to be created to review the audit schedules and recommend measures – e.g. behavioural safety measures and weighting of this to ensure compliance.</p> <p>LC suggested CJ to circulate all audit schedules to review to members for comments. SJ and RS happy to Chair working group. Please nominate members to attend by end of w/c 21<sup>st</sup> September.</p> <p><b>Fatigue Science – Update</b></p> <p>The 3-month project is due to finish the week ending 20/09 – following delays due to C-19. Fatigue Science have noted that they have not received any data from Aarsleff, FK Lowry or DAWSON-WAM. If any companies would like to continue their readiband subscription they can, but they need to contact Gillian at Fatigue Science.</p> <p>Fatigue Science are looking to present their data collection at a meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> of October (details to be confirmed).</p> <p><b>Silica Dust guidance</b></p> <p>Silica Dust Guidance was added to the strategic priorities of the FPS at the last quarterly meeting, prompted by the HSE. CJ stated FPS met with HSE in December 2019, where John Underwood commented that Silica Dust was an area HSE will be focusing on . At EU level, Silica dust has been placed within the Carcinogens Directive, which may explain why it has become an issue for the HSE (Brexit notwithstanding). The issues that need to be considered are what piling related activities will generate dust, what measures should be taken to mitigate and who holds legal responsibility for it.</p> <p>CJ will share the strategic objectives agreed at the last Quarterly meeting of the FPS.</p> <p>CJ stated a Working Group needs to be established and asked for volunteers. GL and CW agreed to participate. RS stated there should be greater participation in working groups and urged members to volunteer outside the meeting too.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>All / C Jennings (CJ)</p> <p>CJ</p> <p>CJ</p> <p>All</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Plant Sub-Group Documents</b></p> <p><b>i) Mechanised Tool Handling – Task Group Update</b></p> <p>CJ requested assistance from Members in relation to the technical content of the document. PH suggested that CJ work with Andy Eggesden to devise a survey or other means to benchmark Members’ progress towards mechanising wherever practicable.</p> <p><b>ii) Restricted Zones – Task group update</b></p> <p>A draft of the guidance document has been circulated. A multitude of responses have been submitted stating real life examples of best practice need to be added to the document. Further comments on the document also need to be reviewed. CJ stated a group of volunteers should be established to review comments and suggestions to enable CJ to produce document. Currently only four FPS Members have submitted photographs, and a range of photos are required from across the membership. CJ stated the principles of the guidance document are currently unclear, and although comments have been added, there remains a challenge due to the varying ideas of what should be included.</p>	<p>CJ / Andy Eggesden</p> <p>All</p>

MM agreed and stated a steer should be given on the guidance, as it is challenging to come up with a one size fits all approach. MM & LC offered the solution to view the document as a utopian approach, as every single environment differs. PH agreed with this approach. PH challenged the group to show those on site what / how they should be operating and hoped the group will seek and find photos to support the document. PH stated the document will be applicable 90% of the time, and recognised changing behaviours is a challenge.

CW shared a picture of an HS2 exclusion zone, and also urged members to submit photographs with the aim of educating people. PH seconded this and stated if a start is not made, nothing will change. SJ inquired whether anyone had tried to apply a Restricted Zone. MM stated he had good examples of where exclusion zones have been implemented but they were not perfect for every job.

CW stated that as the geography of every site is different it can be difficult to implement the standard as depicted in the booklet. He stressed that it is important that customers see the Piling Industry are aiming to make it work.

CJ stated, in response to the issues with the geography of a site, the HSE have a pragmatic view, and for example existing walls on site can form part of a rig guard, and are likely to take the same view in relation to walls and barriers. CJ urged the guidance should be considered as a line in the sand, to indicate what the industry wants the situation to be.

RS asked the restricted zones task group to complete a 'you said we did' document in response to the comments. PH challenged every member company to provide a photo of one of their sites implementing the guidance. PH said he will challenge MDs of those who have not responded at the next quarterly meeting. The document will demonstrate the optimum standard and will require special consideration on site. PH urged the group to consider that how sites are set up is critical to maintain the objective of keeping people out of harm, and again challenged everyone to obtain photos from sites showing this is being achieved. CJ to share an update at the next meeting.

CJ

**iii) Safe Use of Concrete Pumps – Task group update - Product Supply / testing standard (provided by P Matthews)**

CN mentioned a second review of the existing guidance was submitted to the FPS. SJ stated the feedback has been incorporated, and he would reissue document following the meeting. PH thanked SJ for the document and asked if this should be displayed on the websites.

PH stated there had been two accidents on sites recently and discussions had taken place at the Executive Committee, the outcome of which was a request for step by step processes to ensure a systematic approach for both blowing out concrete lines' and dealing with Blockages. PH stated every company has a different way of dealing with these procedures, including down to the level of individual Foremen, which leads to issues. He asserted that a safe procedure for each needed to be defined and set down for all to follow. He noted that it was acceptable to have more than one approach to these operations, but that they need to be specified so that there is absolute clarity over how to carry them out safely.

RS asked for confirmation of the working group. CN confirmed the Group consists of the following members: Simon Jones - Keller, Richard Nicholls - Expanded, Paul Deboo - Premier Pump, and Chris Wallbank – Bachy Soletanche.

PH asked members to submit any company processes to SJ, for the Working Group to consider. PH asked if any companies have a perfect step by step working guide to enable group to find the optimum solution. SG stated she would chase Phil Matthews for the document and ensure this is incorporated into the guidance.

SG / All

**iv) Rig Operator Training – Task group update**

CW mentioned the updated CPCS categories have not moved further forward due to COVID; however simulator training has moved on and there are now two draft standards for comments. The simulators are not yet in the UK, so the next

	<p>action will be to test the scopes with use of the simulators. CW stated they will be arriving in the next two months.</p> <p>CW asked if anyone had any comments on the CPCS standards A46, A47, A48 to provide a response to NOCN. CW stated he would ask IJ/CJ to circulate the document for comments, particularly in relation to rigging or de-rigging procedures. CW stated he had not received feedback on what should be improved based on current criteria. CJ stated members should look at the EFFC Rig Operator Licence Testing Standard which CJ thought considered CPCS guidance, with the aim of harmonising the testing across Europe so everyone is assessed on the same basis. CW stated the FPS were at risk of having parallel conversations and mentioned the International Workers Card created by the NOCN. CW to raise with Mark Buckton and SJ to ask Lorenzo of the EFFC to speak to CW.</p> <p><b>v) Manual Handling – Task group update</b></p> <p>PH shared photo of a BSL accident, regarding moving cement to place into a mixer. PH stated tools are available to reduce manual handling, for example a scissor lifting platform to adjust the pallet height, which has been adopted widely across the business now. PH stated there is also a system using damp sacks and a lifting device. The Working Group is currently discussing how to present this guidance and are looking at adding in pros and cons of different the equipment available to the market.</p> <p>CW stated BBGE have a lifting device with a turntable, which enables rotation of the pallet to minimise lifting. A safety alert has been issued and more information is available from MM if needed.</p> <p>AE has had to step back from the Ops Group due to moving role within Bachy. Volunteers have been identified to progress the piece of work.</p>	<p>CJ / FPS Secretariat</p> <p>SJ</p> <p>All</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>FPS Website – Guidance due for update</b></p> <p>a) NGR Supercatch system (splicing and sonic document)</p> <p>CJ stated that NGR contacted the FPS to ask if the NGR Supercatch System could be incorporated in the FPS splicing and sonic guidance. This system was circulated for feedback earlier in the month. CJ noted the group had had mixed feedback on the system – due to manual handling concerns. RG mentioned he was involved in the working group and stated there are a number of different systems in there, including systems which include manual handling e.g. bulldog clips. RG stated the NGR Supercatch system has a place in the document but need to highlight positives and negatives. It was agreed that CJ would send the master document for RG to update.</p>	<p>RG / CJ</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Behavioural Safety</b></p> <p>i) Discussion</p> <p>SJ and MM presented at a meeting on Behavioural Safety, and found it was useful to share best practices. RS asked if there are any other Members who would like to present, a further meeting could be arranged. CJ asked if all Members have behavioural safety programmes. DH stated Bauer do not run a Behavioural Safety Programme. AT stated Martello instructed a company to run this for them. The group concluded a short guidance document explaining key elements would be beneficial. It was discussed whether a WG on Behavioural Safety should be created, but it was agreed that a dedicated group would not be necessary yet.</p> <p>The question was raised whether there needed to be an FPS Behavioural Safety programme. All agreed the Customer dictates</p>	<p>All</p>

	<p>what is acceptable in relation to Behavioural Safety on each site, and it could be confusing to add further Behavioural Safety guidance, thus also adding to the length of site inductions. It was noted that there can be conflicting behavioural safety programmes at work on site – those of the main contractor and those of the specialist contractor. These programmes tended to have the same objectives, though varied in their language and emphases. CJ stated he would raise this issue with Build UK to see if a pragmatic solution could be agreed.</p> <p>RS asked all members to submit any relevant Behavioural Safety Guidance documents so these can be collated</p> <p>ii) Next meeting</p> <p>It was agreed that, if others had presentations they wanted to share, another meeting could be arranged, or they could be incorporated into the OPS meetings.</p>	<p>CJ</p> <p>All</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>Quarterly Accident &amp; Environmental Statistics</b></p> <p>a) Discussion</p> <p>i) Q2 Statistics</p> <p>RS thanked IJ for her fantastic work on putting the statistics into Power BI to allow for greater analysis, stating the process had provided a substantial improvement in comparison to previous data collection. IJ stated the plan was to publish the anonymised data in the Members Only area of the FPS website and is reviewing ways of doing so.</p> <p>IJ displayed the statistics. PH wanted to ensure the accident frequency rates were displayed. IJ asked for comments on the statistics. RS stated an interest in the details of the overall trends, viewing five years' worth of data. RS stated there has not been much of a reduction in accidents, and the data provides a fairly constant line. CJ asked if the peaks were related to peaks of activity across the industry. RS noted there may be discrepancies across the provision of data and expressed an interest in how companies collate the data and whether this might skew the data. CW stated that there was a marked upturn in the industry in 2019-2020 and a plummet is obviously due to COVID. CW stated some members employ core teams and turn to temporary workforce during a spike, and this has quite often meant a spike in hours. PH stated Bachy reports results on a 12-month rolling performance providing an automatic trend line. SJ thought it could be worth exploring hours across quarters and whether these vary on trend lines. SJ stated contractors are not necessarily included within the data. SJ requested clarity on the man hours that should be captured and asked if these should these be direct employees and contractors? RS stated he would take the information forward with GL to review the data.</p> <p>IJ displayed a page on correlation data, and noted the majority of the Q2 accidents happened within 3 hours into an individuals' shift –IJ asked if most accidents occur after three hours? IJ asked if there was a correlation of break times versus incident times.</p> <p>RS asked if a proposal could be put together with some prices to provide a live stream of data on the FPS website – CJ and IJ to review, and understand what could be achieved with the data and present to the Executive Committee to review. CW – seconded RS opinion with the caveat that the data could be publicly available but with security of data not compromised. RS asked if any Members have any IT experts within their companies who could assist?</p> <p>PH requested everyone ensures the definitions on actions are the same – for example, HiPo accidents, stating we need to be consistent in our terms.</p> <p>In relation to service strikes, CJ stated the statistics may show geographical trends, or a client group trends e.g. housing projects if we can collect the type of job they occurred on and where in the country.</p> <p>RS stated he had been working with the BDA to try and identify members who do not routinely CAT-Scan. RS wondered the thoughts of members on this</p>	<p>C Jennings</p> <p>I Jennings</p> <p>All</p>

matter. GL stated all investigative work should take place before the platform is put in place. RS said he has reported this back to the working group, but asked how due diligence is carried out by the Contractor, with the correct information upon signing off.

HS stated in his experience, a permit to dig is issued, two pages of which are sent to the client, containing the CAT-scanner serial number, the details of the individual who undertook the work, following which a secondary check takes place, as a duty of care. Every site is CAT-scanned before work. CW enquired if the date was recorded – whether this pre-dates the installation of the platform. HS stated RBL had not encountered issues with the thickness of the platform but had picked up anomalies and had then asked if they have scanned, proved and checked the permit to dig. The document requires completion of where the service joins, whether services have been found and if the services and are they in the places they are expected to be. The permit to dig is not fool proof but goes a long way to protecting services. HS also stated a record is put through a reporting system, and the odd service strike does appear for whatever reason, normally low voltage – for example a service to a cabin which had occurred after the CAT-Scan.

SJ then discussed his experience with HS2, where it is a permit to break ground is used, and those receiving the permit operate at the same level as those who have undertaken the scanning. CW agreed they are undertaking the same process on their stretch of HS2. CW stated the Responsible person for excavation may not be doing the scanning themselves but are trained to the same level. SJ has seen this on some parts of HS2 but not all.

RS asked if FPS members should be scanning – if not, how do members verify this has been done? There was one report of a service strike this quarter which is very low. RS asked where the benefit is in scanning?

HS responded by saying RBL completes a permit to scan around the perimeter of the area and they have adopted this approach for a number of years. Paul Smith RBL stated due to this, cable strikes have been greatly reduced and insurance claims have been significantly reduced. PS agreed it is not a fool proof system, and previously there was a loose permit system which was not always completed. PH noted widely different viewpoints in the group, and stated the issue will not be completely avoided purely by the use of CAT-Scanning. PH stated he had not seen evidence from a planning contractor that the use of CAT-Scanners has made a significant change, as the results of the CAT-Scan are not routinely recorded.

PH stated he would seek advice from the FPS Commercial committee, to inquire if CAT-Scanning reduces the number of incidents, whether FPS Members should routinely be undertaking this, without firm evidence to support its undertaking. JC stated he would be intrigued to find out if incidents still occur despite surveys taking place.

A discussion ensued on the Commercial legal aspect, as the view taken by FPS states the legal duty sits with the Main Contractor. CW stated it is clear some responsibility can be delegated for a task but not the legal responsibility for that task. CW stated it would be an unusual outcome to see a specialist contractor being pursued legally.

A lengthy discussion ensued on who the liability sits with and RS stated this should be taken back to the working group. RS stated as FPS members everyone must be diligent on how the work has been undertaken prior to arriving on site. HS stated he will review their records to show if there has been an improvement on incidents since they have been scanning as above.

ii) FPS Member Question –

An FPS member raised a query for the Committee following an incident on site where an operator did not engage the pedal to release the winch drum brake, which resulted in the Kelly rope snapping. Why is there no interface / pressure sensor on the piling rig that could stop this happening?

AT wondered what the FPS standing was on the matter. The supplier stated the issue was a grey area. Soilmecc have some larger rigs have an element to limit the pull down.

Hugh Sloan

	<p>RS asked AT to report back for any response and AT to keep CJ in the loop in reference to the Rig and the age of the rig.</p> <p>RS asked if members want to share any information on accidents.</p> <p>SJ shared slides on a rig topple in Poland. The platform construction was complicated with 9 different levels, and the platform had a variation in colour. A similar process in terms of testing had been completed with records as required in relation to specification. An attempted rescue took place. There was a lack of geogrid or reinforcing materials on the platform. The incident has highlighted issues in reference to delineation of the platform, and the lack of FPS type certificates on the platform and a lack of familiarity of the operators on site. There was also a missing technical document for the LRB 355 in this particular configuration. SJ stated there was a language barrier, and officially the work was taking place on the platform but the testing was not undertaken on the edge of the platform. There was no reinforcement on the edge of the platform, and only 10% of the rig was off the edge but due to the load being off the tracks at the point of the extraction it caused the rig to fall.</p> <p>CW mentioned a rig incident in 2007 where the edge of the platform was not clearly delineated. CJ stated guidance had been updated to include ramps and Members are very aware of the edges of platforms and that incidents could occur there. CW stated in many areas it is not clear the platform has been delineated and where the material is the same it is not clear, and it should be marked in some way. CW asked how much due diligence was being undertaken by everyone?</p> <p>SJ shared two further incidents, one in relation to an Anchoring Rig with an excavation without burst protection, with a failure and the dipper arm which came into contact with the railing. Retrospectively burst protection has been added to the dipper arm.</p> <p>The second incident saw a three metre section of casing from a grapple fall towards three individuals who were on the working platform. The incident highlighted concerns with the operation of grapples and the competency of the operator to use ancillaries. SJ stated a competency assessment has now been introduced. The incident will appear in the Q3 statistics. SJ to share the safety alert with the group. The alert has only just been shared with the client.</p>	<p>AT / CJ</p> <p>SJ</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>Associate Member Questions</b></p> <p>ML – SJ presentation of Polish incident. CSP rotary application. The casing appeared to be up in the air, wondering if the issue was more of a stability issue. SJ stated he had not heard anything from HSEQ about stability issues. ML noted that handling weight is often overlooked regards weight and counterweight</p> <p>An Associate Member question was raised by ML, on the number of hours spent on site induction processes and asked if FPS would be able provide a passport for 90% of the induction processes. Some processes can take 2/3 hours especially if attending for breakdown support.</p> <p>CJ stated a question on standardised site induction processes was raised ca. 4 years ago. CJ stated every site is different and the legal responsibilities of following the process lie with both the client and main contractor. ML stated it seemed like a monumental waste of time and effort and identified HS2 will have its own requirements for Main and Sub Contractors, and within each group its own set, which eat into productive time and wastage. JC asked if this was fed back to the contractor. ML stated this was done regularly. ML stated it was difficult to have a voice on this on a daily basis. SJ agreed a lot of time is spent across inductions and it should be client groups, not Build UK, who should aim to work together.</p>	

9.	<p><b>Occupational Health &amp; Wellbeing in Piling</b></p> <p>All agreed to review the audit schedules to ensure Occupational Health Charter is contained within. No further comments.</p>	
10.	<p><b>Environment and Sustainability Matters</b></p> <p>CJ stated an Environment and Sustainability working group was to be formed specifically with the aim of how to achieve net zero carbon by 2050. The Group will define the actions that can take place now, looking at efficient practice, and a webinar series on sustainability issues to raise awareness on what this means from a practical perspective. CJ will circulate a summary of the group's mission in case there are any volunteers to join. A webinar has already taken place on the Carbon Calculator, with 200 participants. CJ asked if anyone wants to be involved to get in touch. RS agreed the MD's should be made aware.</p>	C Jennings
11.	<p><b>Training</b></p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>a) CPCS Card Renewals now request copies of NVQ certificates are provided, which is causing issues</p> <p>RS stated he had posted this for discussion. RS understands there is now a requirement to submit NVQ certificates as part of the CPCS Card renewal, which has never been requested previously. Many are experiencing issues locating certificates and how to apply for renewals. CW stated NOCN job cards took over the scheme and GDPR means records of NVQ certificates are not held by the NOCN. CW stated this is why this information is being requested. CJ stated he believed GDPR did not dictate information could not be held, but that data could be used with consent. CW agreed. Requests were made for information by CITB but not NOCN. JC stated the issue lays with NOCN not having the consent. CJ stated he believed the legal risk of a GDPR claim being made re the use of data would be low as the information is an enabler for individuals to be able to work. CJ asked if the FPS needed to provide an 'opt-in' approach. CW stated the legal teams at CITB and NOCN are working together. RS stated there had been some occurrences of loss of NVQ certificates, but ensure certificates are supplied to the individual who is asking from a GDPR compliance.</p>	
12.	<p><b>Working Group Reports</b></p> <p><b>i) CPCS Management Committee</b></p> <p>CW International Worker Cards</p> <p>Amnesty for testers – Current testers who would have to attend courses can gain a temporary extension and will gain an extended card and will have to do the training within the temporary extension. First Aid cards inclusive.</p> <p><b>ii)Build UK Health &amp; Safety Committee</b></p> <p>CJ noted that he would look into the status of this group.</p> <p><b>iii)Build UK Common Training Standards Task Group</b></p> <p>CJ stated he believed the common training task group no longer exists.</p> <p>CJ to investigate a Main Contractors group and further Build UK groups.</p> <p><b>iv)Thames Tideway H&amp;S Transformation group</b></p> <p>Thames Tideway group – Johnathan Pearson and Martin Stanley used to report. RS stated HS2 may have a transformation group. CW confirmed this has been talked about.</p>	<p>C Jennings</p> <p>C Jennings</p>

	<p><b>v) National Specialist Accredited Centre</b></p> <p>There was no further information on the Apprenticeship. However, accreditation of Assessors for the group needs to occur. CJ stated CITA and Stephenson College are running another Apprenticeship cohort in September – let CJ know if you have candidates. CW stated he has one apprentice and that there are contractual obligations from HS2 to provide apprentices. CJ to send an email to Members.</p> <p>CJ also stated that Construction Youth Trust who work with disadvantaged young people from inner city London are keen to matchmake apprentices. LC said S106 continually request apprentices as part of the agreements and checking compliance. SJ seconded this. CJ to put SJ and LC in touch with CYT.</p> <p><b>vi)EFFC Health and Safety Working Group</b></p> <p>SJ stated there was nothing to report</p>	<p>C Jennings C Jennings</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>Joseph Forsyth stated he had experienced Contractors asking questions about the frequency of renewing work assessment medicals. RS stated these are typically undertaken every 3 years. GL stated some certificates run for three years but some clients ask for updates. CW experienced this with Highways England, who requested the medicals had to be valid within 12 months. CW found especially with Highways England that if there was a referral note, the outcome of the referral must be specified, to ensure the certificate is accepted, even if the certificate is in date.</p> <p>CN stated if any members had interest in Concrete Clamps, that could be engraved on the date they go out. If interest speak to CN directly. Soilmec may be able to use cameras to gain footage stored for up to two weeks.</p> <p>RS Thanked all for their support during his time as the Chair</p>	
<p>14.</p>	<p><b>Dates of 2020/21 Meetings</b></p> <p>All meetings will be held via Webex for the foreseeable future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> November – Time TBC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Request from SJ for the meeting to be moved to the afternoon.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021</li> <li>• Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> May 2021</li> <li>• Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> September 2021</li> <li>• Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> November 2021</li> </ul>	<p>FPS Secretary</p>