

Study Name: How do ethics influence the development of policies for accessing public collections which are essentially restricted by law: A case study of the Royal Armouries.

Depositor: Stuart Bowes

Date of Interview: 24/03/2022

Interview Transcript: Laura Bell – Director of Collections (Royal Armouries), 24/3/2022

SB: Thank you again for speaking to me. Today I was hoping to carry on some of the conversations we had last time around, but instead of legislation, focusing on the other side of the coin, the museological frameworks that accompany it. To get started, what would you consider to be the principal restrictions placed on the Armouries' weapons collections by museum frameworks that seek to regulate aspects of museum practice? What do you think are the main frameworks that apply to the Armouries' work and specifically that relating to the weapons collections?

LB: I think there will be a theme through these questions that there isn't anything really specific out there for weapons collections. As a national museum, or as most museums and particularly accredited museums, you meet certain standards in terms of management of any collection, the information, access, care. You have to meet those standards because there isn't anything specific. When you look at PAS 197 [*Code for Practice for Cultural Collections Management*], for example, it's got this list of legislation at the back that applies to collections management, and nowhere does it talk about the specifics related to weapons collections or any other specific collection. Nor is there a separate document that you can look at that would do that for you. While we abide by those, there isn't anything specific in the museum world currently. There are some specifics in the Firearm Security Handbook, I think the most recent one is the 2020 one. Before that was it like 2005 or something? They aim to update that, but unfortunately they didn't consult with museums and a lot of it is wrong.

SB: That's a bit of a problem.

LB: Yeah, so we have spoken to them about that. They've said you need to speak to the Museum, Archives and Libraries Council. Well that doesn't exist anymore. Or you need to speak to another group, consortium, which again doesn't exist anymore. Really they could have referred to the Museums Weapons Group as a group that they could have consulted, so they missed that opportunity really. I mean it's not necessarily the specifics of how you care for a weapons collection that would be an issue, I think it talks about cabling them down and I think it talks about how you display them. But what we don't have is something that marries up that

firearms guidance, that comes very much from a Home Office or policing perspective, with the museum guidance. That is what you're looking at, of course.

SB: Yeah, I suppose that's the whole point of the PhD.

LB: Which hopefully will marry the two together and it'll be great. There isn't anything specific, but there are things like the code of ethics which talks about ensuring that you treat everyone equally. Absolutely, we want to do that, but we can't do that for access to our type of collection. We do it as far as we possibly can and then it's amended and dictated for in our own policies. But there's no framework out there that I could look at and say that's what I use, or Katie [Robson, Registrar] uses, for example, on a daily basis.

SB: No, that makes sense. Are there any particular regulations or recommendations that implicitly impacts on the collections, particularly the weapons collections, but obviously other collections as well, where there's a broad focus? Because weapons present much more of a risk. Are weapons treated differently because they are more risky inherently compared to other collections?

LB: Yes, depending on who you're talking to. I think a lot of the guidance and, in fact, the security manual that I mentioned does reference the fact that the way that museums care for collections is pretty much good enough for looking after a firearms collection, because we go over and above to protect those items. In many ways what we're doing as a museum meets what their perceived standard is, not that that's necessarily written down specifically for firearms. For example, if we had a certain member of our local constabulary coming in and they'd not worked with us before, or they'd not worked with weapons before. It's that public perception, the personal perception of what a firearm is and can do, that has an impact on their view on how restricted they need to be. I think it's the interpretation, actually I think we discussed last time, which is more of the issue because there is this gap in policy, provision, and guidance. The interpretation varies depending on who comes to talk to you, so some security advisers, independent or not, will be really across this area, and they will completely understand that we need to protect them, we need to keep them safe and ensure that they're not just accessible freely to all, for people to just walk into the stores. But they also don't believe that we need to cable it down or not allow certain handling to happen. They appreciate that there needs to be flexibility and they look at it from a risk management perspective, which is what we do. But others will

come in and just look at it as a firearm and panic, and they'll say we need to do everything over and above, which would then stop us being able to allow people to really appreciate the collection in the way that we want them to. So it's always a balance and it depends who you get.

SB: That's fair enough. Can you highlight any particular areas where these guidelines and advice go over and above the legislative provisions?

LB: Yes, the NFC [National Firearms Collection], for example. If you are looking at it from the perspective of having a firearms collection of any kind, and you're meeting the legislation, you would think a museum store, alarmed, meeting all their correct standards, all of that would be enough. But because of the size of the collection, over and above West Yorkshire Police basically said that we needed to add extra layers of security, including the airport style checking in and out that we have to do at the NFC. I completely get it, it's on their patch, they need to make sure that we're doing everything possible. But actually, what is the risk other than the fact that there's a few more in there than there is in other firearms stores? Funnily enough, they don't really look at the other firearms store when they come, even though there's licensable weapons in there as well. It's the perception, the way the NFC looks, makes people feel uneasy. But actually, it's over and above what is required by law.

SB: No, that makes sense. Are there any instances where, from a museological perspective, that their requirements are in excess of legislation or is it more from the police and that security side?

LB: I'm trying to think of any instances. No, I think in terms of working with other museums, they appreciate what we tell them as what we need to do, and they don't go, you also need to do this. It's more from the Home Office or the police that we get the over and above depending on what the situation is or how people are interpreting it. I can't think of a situation where another museum has said we're not taking that item because it's a Section 5. I can't even think what they might do over and above. Because we use art shippers, we use high specification cases, we use alarms, we have security. Again, what we do as a museum tends to meet that standard. So unless someone else outside of the sector comes in and says, no, or their local constabulary come along and say you need to think about this, or they don't get the [Museum Firearms] Licence then. Yeah, I can't think of anything.

SB: That's fine. There's lots of regulation swirling around, so it's trying to make sense of it all. Focusing in specifically on some of the particular frameworks that I'm hoping to look at. Do any of the codes of ethics issued by professional museum organisations have much of an impact on the practical work managing weapons? Like the Museums Association's *Code of Ethics* or the *ICOM Code of Ethics*.

LB: A lot of those are about, like I mentioned before, being open and equal to all audiences and people, which is what we sign up to and we are a member of both. But, depending on what it is we need to put in extra policies ourselves, and I'm sure other institutions would do the same to provide for the extra requirements that come with managing specific collections. We absolutely sign up to that and we'll always aim to achieve that, but it isn't always possible when you think about the prohibited persons element of the *Firearms Act* [1968]. Who we can allow to access it, how we manage that, and how we get them to sign off on that. We can't be equal to all, but I'm sure other museum collections are exactly the same. You do your best to achieve that generally, but in certain circumstances, there's always going to be exceptions.

SB: I suppose they prove the rule. Isn't there normally like a proviso saying, to the best of your ability in these sorts of things?

LB: I'm not sure it does say that, but we have to accept that. I'd have to look into it. Yeah, I can't remember what it says, be open and accessible or equal to all. I don't know if there's anything in the paragraph that sits underneath that, but I think that that's assumed.

SB: What about the more the collections focused aspects of this? Talking about due diligence and museums must conduct proper due diligence or they must have solid documentation procedures, that sort of thing. Does that have much of an impact on the weapons collections specifically, or is it more of a general, it feeds into the collections management policies overall?

LB: I would say the latter and I don't think the codes of ethics go into the detail of how you manage the collections. I think it just talks about developing the collections, ensuring that you're caring for, exhibiting, loaning collections with transparency, that sort of thing. Rather than you have to ensure that you document it in this way. That's more like the PAS 197 or collections management guides that you get from Collections Trust or Accreditation, they go into the specifics of that. I think for the code of ethics, it's very general, I think it's stewardship of

collections for MA [Museums Association] and how you look after them, ensure that you're generating and engaging with the public and everything that you do works towards that. I think in that overarching sense, we absolutely do that and will always do that. It's the specifics and the detail that you're referring to. We can document, we can access, we can provide information on, but there are always specifics that relate to individual collections, particularly weapons collections. There are additional checkpoints that we need to have or additional fields on our catalogue that we need to have. So we can do it, but it's just extra layers. A bit more work.

SB: Yes. That's something that's generated more internally, rather than something that's coming in from the outside then?

LB: It is, so there's nothing specific in PAS 197 that says if you hold a weapons collection, you need to also document the licence category. It says that you need to document your collection, I can't remember exactly, but in a transparent way and to the best of your ability and all of that sort of language. Institutions then provide for policies and procedures that are specific to them and their collection, which is what we've got in house.

SB: Yes, that makes a lot of sense. Thank you. Speaking of PAS 197, are there any other areas, given the proportional nature of the regulations, where the Armouries has to go over and above its stipulations? Are its provisions more impactful on the weapons collections because they are weapons collections and inherently more difficult?

LB: Yeah. In all of the areas in PAS 197, the care, the access, the information, and documentation procedures, all of that, you meet a certain basic level that is required. Then for information and documentation, as I've mentioned, you would need the additional fields to ensure that you're meeting the other legislation you need to meet for that specific collection for access. We talk about loans and making the collection accessible and ensuring that it's accessible in many ways, and not just in a physical way. But we haven't, and hopefully this is something that you can develop the thinking on in your PhD, we haven't looked at how we could do more to provide access in either an emotional way or from a digital perspective. Something that avoids the physical access that is so restricted for the type of collection that we hold. That's not saying that people can't hold the weapons, but for prohibited persons, we wouldn't be able to allow that. Then we would need to think through ethically, providing that information digitally for that audience. Is that appropriate? We've still got to develop our thinking on that. At the moment, it

just provides for access in a general sense, whether it's loans, display, stores, and we just need to adjust on the ground, on the day, depending on the situation. We've not worked through all of those scenarios yet. For care, I think what's really interesting about our collection is that conservators need to be skilled in handling firearms, taking them apart, understanding if they're loaded, and X-raying firearms on top of the basic object conservation training. I'm not saying it's basic in any form, but the base level conservation training that they would all have and come with, they need to build up that understanding when they come to us. That's very much part of our collections management framework where we talk about training and expertise, and ensuring that we've got the right staff for our particular collection. But we're also assuming that we're not going to just be able to handpick loads of these people who are already out there, we need to be the ones to develop that.

SB: Yeah. That comes back neatly to the idea of developing the registrars' programme as well, and developing those skills within that sector as well, so it ties in quite neatly there. Just thinking about these frameworks, certainly something like PAS [197] where there's no real enforcement of it, what's the motivation behind the Armouries applying these standards when there's no compulsion to do so?

LB: One, it's accreditation based, the expectation that you meet PAS 197. In fact, they provide templates that fit within the structure of PAS 197 in terms of the policies that you would need to meet PAS 197. So that's the benchmark. There's also an expectation because UKRG [the UK Registrars Group] and other places helped develop this British Standard, therefore it was enforced through various means when it was first launched. Was it 2009?

SB: I think so.

LB: It's been accepted as being the standard, and then from that, all of the guidance that Collections Trust provide is very much linked to PAS 197. It needs a review I think, but it's definitely an expectation that we all meet that. If we all meet that, then it's much easier to work together because we all know that we meet a standard that is mutually beneficial and that if we want to loan an object, we know that they're doing the same things. It's a shared standard that has been accepted for a long time basically.

SB: Yeah, you're all working from the same page.

LB: Yeah. Whether it was that or something else, we would have to have something. But it works quite well in the most part.

SB: So it's more a consensual non-binding agreement really, it's an unspoken agreement.

LB: To a certain extent, but if you want to be an accredited museum – which you would need to get funding, borrow items, do various other things, and be respected – you need to meet that standard. It's prescribed for in that way, but also mutually I think. Even if you're not accredited, you aspire to meet that standard.

SB: Yeah, that's really interesting. Thank you. How they all link together is really something that I've been trying to work out, so this is really useful. Speaking about accreditation, how much have the requirements of the Museums Accreditation Scheme impacted management of the Armouries' weapons collections and collections more broadly?

LB: It's had a huge impact on collections. It's had a huge impact on the museum world. It's a really high standard and is considered by European partners and the US as being a really good standard across the world, and we're respected for that. In fact, I was speaking to Iason [Tzouriadis, Assistant Curator of European Edged Weapons], who's new to the department as a curatorial assistant, he's Greek and he's worked in Italy. He was saying it's really interesting that in my induction week I'm reviewing all of these policies, and he's like, it's really good but it's completely different to the way other places work. He was indicating that he feels like they're slightly behind on developing these standards, rightly or wrongly, I don't know if that's the case. But he was like, I can wear the armour in Italy, you can't do that here. It's just different ways of working. But you speak to your counterparts, it's a really respected standard. So it's had a huge impact on museums, and it's a great way of checking in with ourselves on our health overall, ensuring that we are doing the right thing with this collection and for the public. They will always come up with follow up work, no matter who you are. It's good, it feels like that's extra work, but that is the absolutely right thing to be doing. You do need to ensure that you're checking these things off and that you're checking in every five years to ensure that you're doing these things. Just basic things like making sure you've got a business plan that's budgeted for, and you've got the staff capacity to deliver it. Of course, places aim to do that but just having someone to check that is really useful. In terms of the collections work, namely it's providing the policies and the procedures, ensuring that we're doing everything to the best of our abilities in

terms of due diligence checks, that we're caring for the collection and that's within our capacity to do so. We're not saying we need to do this and we don't have the staff to do it, or we don't have the finances to do it. They will check all of that. But the collections elements of museums work, which you might find – and I'm not trying to push any scope here – but are much more embedded than the rest of it in terms of museums work. Museums working with collections, and developing policies and procedures has been about for a very long time. Managing collections, whether it's been a good or bad management, has been around for a very long time and it's known. PAS 197 was quite easy I think to come up with because it's already very much known that we do these things, it was just providing the framework. But public engagement, audiences, income generation, those elements of museums work are still being worked on and developed, which is good. So when it comes to accreditation, the easiest section is always the collections section, because it is just a matter of saying we've got these policies and procedures in place.

SB: Yeah. Does the Armouries' possession of weapons collections make accreditation any more difficult than the norm, would you say? Or is it very much, this is just how we work, we're used to working with these collections, this is just par for the course for the Armouries, because it's tailored?

LB: I don't think it necessarily makes it more difficult. There's certainly additional elements in our policies and procedures to manage those collections, but it doesn't make the application any more difficult. The only thing that is perhaps slightly different is when we do our security reviews of our facilities and the various sites that we've got, it's an additional part of that review, the management of weapons. But in terms of the actual application, so long as you can say you've had that review, they don't go into the detail of it.

SB: Could you speak a little bit more about what that review entails? If you have the knowledge of it?

LB: You would need to speak to Jen [Kaines, Head of Collections Services] or Katie. It was a long time ago that I've been part of one of those reviews, but it's ultimately someone coming in and ensuring that you're meeting the standards. It's either the National Security Adviser that comes in or he delegates it to another party close by to come in. He might say there's some follow up work from last time, or they were talking about having an object in the streets and therefore can you just ensure they've not done that, can you ensure that the shutters are closing

off all of the collections. It's very general, but as I say, it depends on who you get, whether they start to delve in deeper with the weapons, or whether they stick to the normal script for any building. But Katie should have the most recent review and survey, and I'm sure she can provide that for you.

SB: Yeah, thank you. That would be really helpful, I'll ask her. I'm just thinking, the accreditation guidelines were recently updated in 2018, I believe. Did that have any impact on the management of the Armouries' collections? Or was it very much, this is just a revision and we're already implementing most of the things that it suggests?

LB: Yeah, I mean the changes were more to do with trying to make it easier for people to apply and extending the deadline. It used to be every three years, it's every five years. I mean this isn't specific to our collections, but we did speak about the collections development policy template that they provide and we said that that isn't policy. Numerous places said that, but we all still need to meet that template now, so they didn't take into account our views on that. But no, there wasn't major changes, it was all to do with the language, the supporting application information, the assessor, it was making it easier for places to apply. Not making it over the top, like every three years. Things don't change that frequently, corporate plans are normally five years. There wasn't any major changes to the collections section, for example.

SB: Okay, thank you for that. Do you foresee the Armouries having to make any major changes ahead of its next accreditation return, whenever that may be?

LB: Well, you can ask Jen about that. Jen's doing the accreditation application as we speak and I think what the impact has been from COVID. We actually applied pre-COVID, and we had our visit in January 2020, so it was all ready to go to their board and committee in April and that didn't happen. We're having to reapply, so we're having to adjust the information that we're sending on the basis of changes we've made because of COVID. Remote working, the impact of visitor figures, that sort of thing. But nothing specific to collections, that's all remained the same.

SB: That's useful, thank you. I'll follow up with Jen on that.

LB: She can tell you all the specifics about any changes she's made in certain areas, but as far as I'm concerned, all the policies and procedures still stand. It was how we went about doing them,

what was the most efficient way of working, the hybrid model, and all of that that was impacted. Not actually what we're doing, it's more how we were doing it.

SB: Yeah, that makes sense. Thank you. Just moving on a little bit to speak about loans, which is something we haven't particularly covered very much yet. What extent do institutional standards designed to regulate institutional loans, something like the Government Indemnity Scheme, how do they affect the Armouries' operations? Again, specifically in relation to weapons collections?

LB: They don't, is the basic answer, and the reason being is they don't specify anything over and above. In Appendix D and E in the GIA [Government Indemnity] guidelines for national institutions, it talks about the security requirements, the transport requirements and there is nothing specific to weapons collections. We know that we have to deal with that, and we will meet that. But we also know we have these licences that we need to deal with and so we do an over and above. But GIA doesn't stipulate we need to do over and above.

SB: Okay. So again, this isn't set out specifically, but it's the recognition that you need to do more to proportionally ensure the safety of the collections and of everyone involved with them.

LB: Yeah. I guess the impact, if I'm delving in a little bit deeper, would be the National Security Adviser visits because he's the one who sits within the GIA team and looks at the security requirements of institutions. If he was to visit, or whoever the NSA was, and outline that he wasn't happy with some things we were doing, he would have to point to something and say you're not meeting this guideline and we wouldn't be able to. But if he, personally, wasn't happy with it, we might have an issue in applying for GIA. But it's not because we've not met the GIA requirements because they are not specific to weapons collections.

SB: Again, it's the interpretation over and above where friction might occur.

LB: Yeah, it's individual basis. If he personally wasn't happy and we didn't have a good relationship with him, that would be an issue, whether it was because of something we're doing related to the weapons or because of that relationship just going sour for other reasons. That would be an issue for us. But the GIA requirements are pretty basic and standard in terms of what you need to do to secure items when they're on loan.

SB: Thank you. The other loan framework that I was thinking of is the UKRG Facilities Report. Is that something that you build on in your own loans documentation procedures and is there any scope for weapons to be included as part of that? Are there any other things you have to add specifically for weapons as a part of that, or is it very much a standard template?

LB: It's a very standard template and it needs reviewing, which we've all said. There's a lot of crossover with the various supplements, so it needs a review generally. There isn't anything specific to weapons collections in there. In our loans checks procedures – if you've not seen them yet, you can get Katie to provide them – but in terms of going through a loan application we would have to meet off additional things. Ensuring that they have a licence, ensuring that they've got a Section 5 shipper to transport it as a Section 5 item, those sorts of things. That's all provided for in our own internal loan checks, but the security, display, and facilities supplements are all very general.

SB: Yeah, that makes sense. There is very much a theme emerging here.

LB: Yeah, I read the questions before and I thought I could probably answer all of them with one. But I think you probably knew that already from the work that you've seen that we're doing our best to interpret both sides and bringing them together in our own policies. But there isn't one place that covers both for us.

SB: That is very much the impression that I've got so far. I think it's just having the knowledge of the internal bit is the bit that I'm missing.

LB: Yeah. It's seeing how we provide for it internally and checking that off against what is out there at the moment. We're interpreting it as well to a certain extent.

SB: Yeah, it's filtered through all these various organisations and individuals. That leads us onto a broader question now, do you think these regulatory frameworks, particularly the museums-oriented ones, do you think they suitably account for weapons collections in their current form? Do you think they should do, as well?

LB: No, they don't. They don't account for weapons collections. Do I think that they should? Not necessarily. I think it's fine to have something that's overarching, that is general for all museums. I think it's also fine for certain museums, whether it's weapons collections,

archaeological collections, to have policies and procedures that fit over and above. What I think would be useful is that there's supplementary guidance around specific collections. For firearms collections management, I've been thinking about providing guidance via Collections Trust and we've been speaking about that. We can do something. We could have a Subject Specialist Network to provide advice, guidance, and a place to go, and we can provide supplementary stuff. But I don't think the overarching guidance should be changed because it needs to be applicable to all institutions.

SB: I suppose it has to, the whole point of these frameworks is that they are broad enough to fit all museums. The supplementary guidance, what you think would be the best way of doing it? Under which organisation? How to enforce it, whether it would be part of accreditation or whether it would just be more advisory in its scope?

LB: I think because these specific collections are specific, you would need the experts in those areas to assess you on them. I don't think an accreditation assessor should be looking at how we are meeting the firearms legislation, for example. But what you could do is provide guidance, whether it's through UKRG, whether it's through ACE [Arts Council England], whether it's through a British Standard, that brings those experts together. The Home Office, the National Security Adviser, and then institutions that manage those types of collections to combine their thinking and provide a standard interpretation that other institutions can use. I think as long as it's rubber stamped by those experts, then that is good enough. I don't think an accreditation assessor would feel comfortable assessing us on that. But they could know that we've checked the box to say yes for our specific collection, we manage our specific collection in the way that they would like us to in terms of documentation, access, information, and all of that.

SB: That does make complete sense. Do you think that would be something that the Museum Weapons Group would be ideally placed to lead on?

LB: We've been talking about it, and we've got it in our corporate plan to consider an SSN [Subject Specialist Network]. I've been working with Freda Matassa and the University of Leeds in possibly writing, you've probably seen her collections management books, something like that specific for firearms. I think as long as it comes from an institution like us, who've got the expertise and that is rubber stamped by the various law enforcing authorities, then I think that

covers what we would need. But the Museum Weapons Group is definitely well placed for that and we have spoken about it.

SB: Wonderful. That all sounds very interesting and hopefully will be fruitful. Obviously I'm happy to get involved in whatever capacity, if it's necessary. Thank you for your thoughts about that. Now to move to the specific case study that I was hoping to discuss. Last time you mentioned about the National Security Adviser suggesting that the Armouries should cable down its weapons when on display. Could you just elaborate more on the circumstances behind that and the arguments that were brought out for and against it?

LB: I wasn't really part of it, it was something I was aware of, so I think you need to speak to Jen and Katie about specifics. I don't think it was as much as him saying you have to do this, it was like you should consider this because other institutions do it. I'd need to look at the Firearms Security Handbook again and see if there was a provision in there, I seem to remember something about that, you should aim to do that. Our view was that that would ruin the display. Nor did we feel from a risk perspective that was needed. I'm not sure he was looking for a response or whether it's just consider this, so you'd need to double check that with them.

SB: Yeah, of course. Do you know if they were developed in relation to existing guidance, whether that's legislative or whether that was more advisory guidance from the museum sector? Or was it more practical considerations on both sides?

LB: I would say it was more practical. I don't think, unless it is in that Firearms Security Handbook, that there's anything provided for out there. I think he was seeing other institutions taking that view and, in his eyes, speaking for him in a way because I'm not quite sure where it came from. But he saw IWM [the Imperial War Museum] were doing that, and he perhaps just thought it's an extra layer of security. Are you going to start thinking about that for licensable weapons? Our view was no, but IWM do it. I think he was trying to come up with a way that we all standardise the way that we look after these collections, but we're not quite there yet. I think there's more to work through, whether it is in the Firearms Security Handbook or not, I don't think that was consulted on and therefore it needs a review generally.

SB: Yeah, I can understand that and that's where the development of advice covering the whole of firearms management, that's where that becomes really useful and you get that standardisation across the sector.

LB: Yeah. When we talk about these extra provisions, we can look at it from our perspective and think it's a national museum, we could probably do it. It might look a bit rubbish, but we could afford to do it, so maybe we just do it. But other smaller institutions, if we take a lead on that, then those institutions wouldn't be able to meet the requirements because they just financially aren't able to meet all of those security provisions. We have to think beyond what we're doing and think about what the sector needs. It's the same when we've reviewed firearms licensing fees, I think was thousands initially put down. Well, you're going to have all of the regimental museums giving up the firearms. Do we want that? It's more than just the nationals and standards, it's about what we're trying to do as institutions for the public's sake. You've got to balance it out because we wouldn't want to take in all of the weapons from regimental museums. We've probably got a lot of them, but it's worth them having them for their audiences, for their communities that really appreciate them, particularly veterans going in and looking at the kit that they had. You have to think of it in the round and not just, we could do it but it's a bit rubbish for us. It's much greater if we go yes, because that means we're saying yes for everyone's sake.

SB: Yes, and I suppose it helps champion a more diverse sector. Not one that's dominated by particular interpretations or particular practices.

LB: Absolutely, yeah.

SB: Excellent. That's everything I wanted to speak about specifically today, but I don't know if there's anything you'd like to add about anything we've spoken or anything you'd like to clarify.

LB: No, I can't think of anything. I mean it would be quite useful to try and map across some of the standards to meet in the middle and where we've got to, and whether that's mapped appropriately. But whether that's part of the scope, I don't know, something we can do in house. But no, I don't think there's anything I've got to add on the general themes of today.

SB: Well, thank you very much. I'll end the recording there then.