

CAETS Going Forward – Findings

7 September 2016

One of the highlights of the CAETS Council Meeting in 2015 was the CAETS Going Forward discussion, which brought to the table many suggestions from member academies on how to maximise the value of CAETS. In order to maintain momentum, and to ensure that CAETS ambitions align with the capacity of the network, a strategic review of the CAETS governance, operational mechanisms, and objectives was agreed at the March 2016 Executive Committee Meeting.

A Strategic Review Committee comprised of CAETS members, and Chaired by our President-Elect, Dr Elias Fereres has been convened to oversee the review process. The terms of reference for the Strategic Review Committee can be found at Annex 1. As part of the Strategic Review a questionnaire was circulated to all member academies, the questionnaire can be found in Annex 2.

This paper presents the findings of the questionnaire and makes some high level conclusions and recommendations for discussion at the CAETS council meeting on 15 September.

Questionnaire responses

Of the 26 members of CAETS, responses were received from 17 members, with six members returning multiple responses from different individuals, to give a total of 24 responses.

Responses received from:

Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering (ATSE) x2

Royal Belgium Academy of Applied Sciences (BACAS)

Canadian Academy of Engineering (CAE) x2

Chinese Academy of Engineering (CAE)

Engineering Academy of the Czech Republic (EA CR)

Danish Academy of Technical Sciences (ATV)

German Academy of Science and Engineering (acatech)

Hungarian Academy of Engineering (HAE)

Indian National Academy of Engineering (INAE)

The Engineering Academy of Japan (EAJ)

The National Academy of Engineering of Korea (NAEK)

Academy of Engineering (AI), Mexico x3

Slovenian Academy of Engineering (IAS)

South African Academy of Engineering (SAAE), South Africa x2

Royal Academy of Engineering (RAI), Spain x2

National Academy of Engineering of Uruguay (ANI)

National Academy of Engineering (NAE), USA x2

Not all responses included answers to every question. In its role as CAETS President and convenor of this discussion, the Royal Academy of Engineering (UK) did not provide an academy response.

While the responses set out in this paper provide no clear single direction forward for CAETS, we have used the survey results to create three broad scenarios for the steering group to discuss initially. Although CAETS' future path will probably incorporate elements of multiple scenarios, these can be seen as the three clearest options for bringing ambition and capacity into balance.

Networkers

This scenario prioritises the value of CAETS membership to CAETS academies, and recasts CAETS as a network of engineering academies focused on knowledge exchange, collaboration and learning from best practice. It requires no immediate change to administrative capacity, and little or no governance reform, although a splitting of the Presidency from hosting of the convocation may be seen as positive for improving opportunities for knowledge exchange and networking. The CAETS objectives would be recast as the goals each CAETS member should aspire to in its engagement nationally, or the characteristics demanded of each CAETS academy. CAETS would focus future growth on communicating with, engaging and supporting members and future members, and building a repository of best practice on national engineering leadership (for example through the IKEST platform).

Strivers

This scenario foregrounds the CAETS objectives, and would see CAETS gradually building its capacity, presence and authority as a global source of engineering excellence through carrying out programme work for external global stakeholders. In this scenario, an immediate change in governance would be desirable, with multi-annual presidencies helping CAETS to develop and deliver on relationships with key international stakeholders, along with an initial moderate rise in administrative capacity to work with the presidency to develop and implement a strategic plan. Administrative capacity would grow alongside programme and project work.

Powerhouses

Under this scenario, CAETS would also push harder to achieve its objectives and establish itself as a globally recognised source of engineering expertise, but the primary impetus would come through a large increase in resourcing from member academies, primarily stronger academies. In this scenario there would be a dramatic immediate change in the resourcing and governance of the network. Larger academies would draw upon their own networks to improve CAETS' profile, capacity and relationships; there might inevitably be some quid pro quo in aligning CAETS' strategic objectives to those of its largest members.

The Steering Group is asked to discuss the optimal relationship between CAETS ambitions and capacity based on the results of the survey, referring where necessary to the scenarios above.

There were divergent views on expansion of the CAETS membership. Perhaps one of the reasons for the lack of clarity in this area is that it is difficult to discuss the future membership without a consensus view on what CAETS wants to achieve. We recommend to the steering group to focus initially on the trade-off between ambition and capacity; it would be a good idea then to have a discussion on 15 September about future membership in the light of the recommendations made in this area.

More in-depth information on the results of the survey is given below.

Value of CAETS

Each member academy was asked to articulate the value they received from being a member of CAETS. Many responses cited multiple values. The answers were able to be broadly divided into five overlapping themes:

- **International platform**

For many academies being a member of CAETS provided them with international visibility and is key to facilitating interaction and cooperation at an international level.

"It is our unique international relationship"

"CAETS provides the member Academies a platform to create and share value"

"Reputation"

- **Networking**

Networking was regarded as a clear tangible benefit from CAETS having resulted in the formation of a variety of subsequent initiatives.

"Broad scientific and engineering network"

"A strong link into international network of like-Academies around the world"

"The principal value CAETS provides is the opportunity to meet, know and develop relationship with the leadership of other engineering Academies on this planet."

- **Collaboration**

Many bilateral and multilateral collaborations have arisen as a consequence of CAETS membership, although not all such collaborations are part of CAETS' activities.

"Prime value is the extensive network and cooperation across the CAETS membership"

"Use contacts to develop bilateral workshops and exchanges"

- **Sharing knowledge, issues and experiences**

CAETS provides a global forum for sharing knowledge, issues and experiences on topics relevant to engineering and technology.

"Knowledge on trends in engineering communities worldwide"

- **Learning from best practice**

Learning from best practice is regarded as especially important for smaller and newer member academies.

"Learn and exchange best practices from other Academies"

Objectives, strategy and priorities

To better understand CAETS members' perspectives on the current role of CAETS, the questionnaire asked CAETS members if they felt the CAETS objectives and CAETS strategy, which began with a five-year plan in 2006 and evolved to a continuing plan of priorities, are still relevant today; to what extent CAETS is working to fulfil its objectives and priorities; and how the objectives, strategy and priorities could be improved?

For both the objectives and the priorities the significant majority of CAETS member academies who responded to the questions (19 responses, representing 15 members) felt that both the objectives and priorities are still relevant for today. In comparison just one response felt that the objectives and priorities were not relevant for today, while four responses (3 members) answered 'somewhat' to both questions.

Nevertheless, despite the consensus that the CAETS objectives and priorities are still relevant for today, the CAETS members believe there are ways the objectives and priorities can be improved and better fulfilled.

The majority of suggestions on how the CAETS objectives, strategy and priorities, and their implementation could be improved were aligned and thus the findings are presented together.

The findings focused on six main themes:

1. **Resourcing.** A need to be realistic in what CAETS can achieve considering its structure and level of resourcing. This issue was directly addressed by a later series of questions in the questionnaire and the findings can be found in the paper under the heading 'Ambitions and Capacity'. In addition, the issue of differing levels of resourcing at the level of individual CAETS members should also be considered, as it has an impact on the level of participation member academies can commit to and therefore how CAETS can work towards achieving its objectives and priorities.
2. **Plan for implementation.** It was felt by many that there was not enough focus on how the objectives and priorities of CAETS could be achieved and even if they are in fact achievable. Therefore, it is hard to tell how well CAETS is working to fulfil these objectives. Several responses suggested that it would be useful for a clear plan of implementation to be drawn up.
3. **Fewer and focussed.** Several responses suggested that a smaller set of more focussed objectives and priorities that align with each other would be considered an improvement. Again, several members suggested that a clear plan of implementation should also be included. For the priorities a clear order of prioritisation would be welcomed by some.
4. **Project work.** Many responses expressed a desire for CAETS to embark on more specific project work, focussed on mutually agreed topics with a global impact. It was suggested that such project work could potentially mobilise funding through project grants from external sources. This idea is also discussed in the paper under the heading 'Ambitions and Capacity'. In addition, many responses articulated a desire to develop closer links between member academies and to collaborate more, and suggested that joint projects could be a way to increase interaction.
5. **Reflect value of CAETS.** A few responses felt that the objectives and priorities did not adequately reflect what they perceived to be the core values of CAETS, specifically networking and collaboration.
6. **Relationships with international organisations.** Several members wished to see CAETS seeking to develop more practical mechanisms to engage with those on the international engineering stage, in part to address concerns that CAETS was not adequately fulfilling objective *i) Prepared to advise governments and international organisations on technical and policy issues related to its area of expertise* or priority *ii) Promote constructive collaboration with international technological organizations of the UN System, and IAC, ICSU, WFEO and other non-governmental organisations.* However, views were mixed with other members questioning how realistic it was for CAETS to increase its engagement with international organisations.

There were also a few novel ideas of how the objectives and priorities could be improved and better fulfilled, including:

- Ensure a seamless transition of power between CAETS Presidencies
- Increase involvement of the younger generation
- Increase participation of affiliated organisations
- Increase the impact of CAETS through the media
- Organise small meetings focussed on specific topics
- Increase the international standing of the convocation

Governance

A majority of CAETS members (13 responses, representing 12 member academies) felt that the current governance structures are fit for purpose in pursuance of CAETS objectives and strategy, compared to 7 responses (representing 7 member academies) who disagreed and do not think they are fit for purpose, while 4 responses (representing 3 member academies) felt they were 'somewhat' fit for purpose.

Nevertheless, numerous suggestions for how the current governance structures could be improved were made.

Presidency

Twelve responses (representing 9 member academies) thought that the Presidential term should be extended, with the majority advocating a two-year term. It was suggested that increasing the Presidential term could help the President progress the implementation of CAETS strategy and objectives. In alignment with an extended Presidential term several responses also suggested that the term of the Executive Committee and Board should be extended as well.

Only a few members chose to give views on rotation versus election of the CAETS Presidency and those views were mixed, with 3 responses (representing 2 member academies) advocating election, while 2 responses (representing 2 member academies) saw benefits of the current rotation system.

A majority of responses (11 responses, representing 10 member academies) felt that the CAETS Presidency should be decoupled from Chairing the CAETS convocation compared to 4 responses who disagreed and 4 responses who selected *don't know*. Suggestions for how the convocation should be Chaired were varied. Two responses suggested that the President-elect should Chair the convocation. Several responses suggested selecting the convocation Chair based on submissions of proposals from member academies. Suggestions were also made about how the burden on the Chairing academy could be reduced, including other member academies committing to assist the Chairing academy, the CAETS secretariat supporting the convocation and the establishment of a CAETS committee to take responsibility for the content of the convocation.

Secretariat

Much praise for the current CAETS secretariat was forthcoming, alongside acknowledgement by many member academies that if CAETS is to meet its ambition the secretariat role would need to be strengthened and expanded. It was also noted that a lot of additional secretariat support is provided by staff of the President's Academy. Although there was not a consensus view on how CAETS could provide a strengthened secretariat, it was widely acknowledged that a strengthened secretariat would require increased funding.

"A better structure would require a magnitude jump in resources."

Council Meetings

With regard to the Council meeting, 8 responses (representing 7 member academies) were happy with the current format, but there were many suggestions of possible improvements from other academies. Several members had collaboration at the heart of

their improvement, suggesting Council meetings could be an opportunity to explore areas for potential collaboration between members. Many members also wanted to see the content of the Council Meetings align more closely to the CAETS objectives and strategy of CAETS. One member suggested that Council meetings could be used as an opportunity to assess the progress CAETS had made in achieving its objectives and priorities with the Board and Executive Committee presenting impact reports every two years. It was also suggested that the meetings should not focus on too many matters and greater participation from all Academies should be encouraged, even if that required more preparatory work from the member Academies.

Other

Many member academies expressed a desire for more frequent communication with CAETS, including more frequent meetings. However, it is clear that an increase in meeting frequency will only be feasible for many member academies if the meetings can be virtual meetings.

Other suggestions to improve the governance structures of CAETS included:

- Strategic review every six years
- An increase of regional groups
- Regular newsletters

Ambitions and Capacity

Many of the members' responses to a variety of questions included discussion of the difficulty of balancing the ambition of CAETS with its capacity. However, question eight in the questionnaire specifically sought to investigate CAETS members' views on this topic, exploring how the ambitions of CAETS align with its capacity (where capacity encompasses funding, human resources, and extent to which member academies are able to be involved). Five statements were presented and CAETS member academies were asked to select the statement they most agreed with. The statements were:

i) The ambitions of CAETS align well with its capacity

ii) The capacity of CAETS needs to be increased for CAETS to achieve its current ambitions. However, our Academy is unlikely to be able to increase its level of involvement in CAETS.

iii) The capacity of CAETS needs to be increased for CAETS to achieve its current ambitions. However, our Academy is unlikely to be able to increase its level of involvement in CAETS and would favour refinement of the Objectives and Priorities to reflect this.

iv) The capacity of CAETS needs to be increased for CAETS to achieve its current ambitions. Our Academy is likely to be willing to increase its level of involvement in CAETS to achieve its Objectives and Priorities.

v) Our Academy would be willing to increase the capacity of CAETS through increased involvement, but this would be dependent on a refreshed Strategy

Statements ii), iii) and iv) were each selected by four members, and represented 12 of the 15 responses (12 members) who selected a statement. The common feature of these three statements is that they all include the statement 'The capacity of CAETS needs to be increased

for CAETS to achieve its current ambitions'. Where the statements differ is how the CAETS members believe this imbalance between ambition and capacity should be addressed. Only two responses felt the ambitions of CAETS aligned well with its capacity (statement i) and only one response selected statement v.

Given the wide acknowledgment among CAETS members for the capacity of CAETS to be increased for CAETS to achieve its current ambitions, members suggested a variety of ways by which CAETS could increase its resourcing, although only 8 responses (representing 8 member academies) would consider paying more while a majority of 12 responses (representing 10 member academies) would not. Several CAETS members felt the need to point out that even if they wanted to contribute more financially to CAETS it just would not be feasible given their own level of resourcing. For example, one member stated that CAETS membership fees accounted for 2% of their annual budget.

Eleven responses suggested ways CAETS could seek increased funding including:

- Seek project funding
This suggestion occurred most frequently and from a variety of members, suggestions of potential sources of project funding included the UN, the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation and national governments. However, many responses stated that for projects to win funding and have approval from CAETS, that they would need to be well planned, global in their reach and well aligned with the strategy and objectives of CAETS, and inspire valuable contributions from CAETS member academies. It should also be noted that a number of CAETS members expressed an interest in increased project work in their responses to other questions in the questionnaire.
- Expand membership
- Seek sponsorship from the private sector
- Request payment or subscription fees for suitable activities
- Increase membership fees

Membership

The questionnaire investigated CAETS members' views on the criteria for membership and procedures for admissions of new members as detailed in Article 2 of the CAETS Bylaws.

Members were asked if the criteria and procedures for membership should be revised, followed by a request for ideas of how the criteria and procedures could be improved. Of the 22 responses to this question. 11 responses (representing 9 member academies) thought that the criteria and procedures for membership should be revised, while a minority of 9 responses (representing 8 member academies) disagreed. Two responses (representing 2 member academies) recorded '*don't know*' as their answer. However, only a few responses gave ideas as to how the criteria for membership and procedures should be revised, suggestions included:

- Electronic voting
- Changing the requirement for an affirmative vote to:
 - an affirmative vote of at least half of all members
 - an affirmative vote of 75% of all members
- Reducing the time a potential applicant has to have been established before the applicant can be considered for admission to CAETS from five to three years

The questionnaire sought to further explore CAETS members' views on the admission of applicants from Academies that have a strong engineering section but a wider remit than just

engineering, in the past requests for membership from such applicants have been refused. CAETS members' views were mixed on how such requests should be dealt with: a minority of 3 responses wished to admit such applicants to CAETS, 9 responses (representing 8 member academies) thought such applicants should continue to be excluded from CAETS, but might be considered for participating in CAETS activities, while 11 responses (representing 9 member academies) wished to continue to exclude such applicants.

Reasons cited by members explaining why they thought membership of CAETS to applicants with a strong engineering section but a wider remit than just engineering should be considered included:

- Engineering Academies can often spin off from existing scientific Academies in developing countries and CAETS should have a role in helping the development of such organisations towards CAETS membership.
- Widening CAETS membership will increase CAETS funding as membership fees would be collected from an increased number of members.

One member suggested that participation in CAETS activities by applicants with a strong engineering section but a wider remit than just engineering could be evaluated and regarded as trial period to full membership.

CAETS Going Forward- Strategic Review

Terms of Reference

Context and Background

One of the highlights of the CAETS Council Meeting in 2015 was the CAETS Going Forward discussion, which brought to the table many suggestions from member academies on how to maximise the value of CAETS. In order to maintain momentum, and to ensure that CAETS ambitions align with the capacity of the network, we are proposing a strategic review of the CAETS objectives and governance and operational mechanisms.

CAETS was founded in 1978 as a network of engineering academies with a set of objectives based on highlighting and strengthening the role of engineering globally (Annex 1). Since then, much has changed in both the community of engineering academies and the global context in which they operate. A light-touch review took place in 2005 but this did not include in-depth consideration of CAETS' mission and strategy. It is therefore timely to conduct a strategic review of CAETS, with a view to ensuring the future relevance and effectiveness of the organisation. This review will examine the strategic objectives of the organisation, as well as the governance and operational structures that are in place to support delivery of these.

Purpose

CAETS currently functions as a self-sustained network, with member academy fees the primary and only source of income. From its outset, CAETS made a decision to add value through networking academies rather than focussing on international policy activities.

Developments of relevance since its formation include:

- The CAETS network has grown and now stands at 26 engineering academies
- Although engineering academies exist in many countries, in some countries (often in those with less capacity), engineering is grouped with science, and there is a question over whether membership should be broadened to include these institutions
- The international landscape for science and engineering is changing, and the federation of international science academies who have focussed on global governance are making moves to consolidate and are seeking engineering input
- The European Council of Applied Sciences, Technologies and Engineering (EuroCASE) has signed an MOU with four other European academy organisations to provide scientific to the European Commission under the Science Advice Mechanism.

Scope and Conduct

The review is expected to be wide ranging. It will examine:

- The CAETS objectives and whether these are still relevant for the network today
- The role of the Board of Directors, Executive Committee, Council and Secretariat
- The rotation of the CAETS presidency, and whether this should be de-coupled from the Convocation to relieve burden on academies, and increase the Presidency function
- CAETS relationship with other international science and engineering stakeholders and with the UN and other global institutions.
- CAETS approach to strategy development, including its relationship with other international networks and organisations.

It is intended that a broad range of views will be canvassed requiring:

- An online CAETS questionnaire, to find out what the members want from the network
- Follow up discussions with member academies organised regionally, and led by a member of the strategic review committee.

External expertise may be called on if required.

It is anticipated any recommendations for changes to governance will be voted on by all CAETS members.

Schedule – to be revised

Phase 1: March 2016

Agree the ToR at CAETS Executive Committee Meeting

Phase 2: April 2016

Questionnaire CAETS members to collect thoughts

Phase 3: June 2016

The Strategic Review Committee to consider the results and decide on a range of Suggestions

Phase 4: September 2016

The Strategic Review Committee to present an Interim report to the CAETS council meeting, with formal agreement from the next CAETS President that this review will continue until conclusion.

Strategic Review Committee

The Strategic Review Committee will report to current President of CAETS Professor Dame Ann Dowling OM FRS FREng and will include representatives from a diverse range of member academies.

Dr Elias Fereres, President of the Royal Academy of Engineering, Spain, has agreed to Chair this group.

1. Full Name
2. Academy Affiliation
3. What value does being a member of CAETS give to your Academy?

4. The CAETS Objectives were developed in the General Rules and Guidelines in operation in the 1980s and 1990s and were edited to Bylaw format in 2000.

Objectives

i) Prepared to advise governments and international organizations on technical and policy issues related to its areas of expertise

ii) Contribute to the strengthening of engineering and technological activities to promote sustainable economic growth and social welfare throughout the world

iii) Foster a balanced understanding of the applications of engineering and technology by the public

iv) Provide an international forum for discussion and communication of engineering and technological issues of common concern

v) Foster cooperative international engineering and technological efforts through meaningful contacts for development of programs of bilateral and multilateral interest

vi) Encourage improvement of engineering education and practice internationally

vii) Foster establishment of additional engineering academies in countries where none exist

viii) Undertake other projects, programs, and activities

a) To what extent do you believe CAETS fulfils these objectives and how could CAETS do it better?

b) Do you think these objectives are still relevant for CAETS today?

Yes

No

Somewhat

c) How could the objectives be improved?

5. The CAETS Strategy began with a five year plan in 2006 and evolved to a continuing plan of priorities.

Priorities

i) Address and advise on significant international engineering and related issues on the basis of CAETS Symposia and Convocations

ii) Promote constructive collaboration with international technological organizations of the UN System, and IAC, ICSU, WFEO and other non-governmental organisations

iii) Discuss national technology and academy operational issues of mutual interest at annual Council meetings

iv) Encourage topic-specific collaboration through interacademy committees/working groups involving representatives of a few or several member academies

v) Encourage bilateral collaboration between member academies and multilateral collaboration among member academies within regional groups

vi) Promote and encourage the growth of national academies of engineering and technological sciences

a) To what extent do you believe CAETS is working towards these priorities and how could CAETS do it better?

b) Do you think these priorities are still relevant for CAETS today?

Yes

No

Somewhat

c) How could these priorities be improved?

d) How could CAETS approach to strategy development be improved?

6. The Presidency of CAETS is a one year term and is allocated by rotation of all member academies. The Executive Committee also operates for a one year term and is composed of the President, President-elect, Past President and Secretary/Treasurer. The Board of Directors is composed of the Executive Committee and six other member academies. The provision of secretariat support for CAETS is one person in a part-time role.

a) Do you think the governance structures are fit for purpose in pursuance of CAETS objectives and strategy?

Yes

No

Somewhat

Please use the box if you wish to make any further comments

b) How could the Presidency better contribute to leading CAETS and fulfilling CAETS strategy and objectives? *Issues to consider: length of Presidential term, rotation versus election and role in the development of CAETS strategy.*

c) How could the governance structures be improved? *Issues to consider: composition and term of Executive Committee and Board of Directors and frequency of meetings*

d) What type of support, including secretariat, does CAETS need to best fulfil its strategy and objectives?

7. What format would you like to see the Council meeting's take, and what items would you like to see covered?

8. A highlight of CAETS activities is the annual convocation which is Chaired and hosted by the member academy holding the Presidency of CAETS. Chairing and hosting the convocation requires time and resources, thus, combined with the Presidency it can prove quite a burden.

a) Do you think the CAETS Presidency and Chairing the CAETS Convocation should be de-coupled?

Yes

No

Don't know

b) How do you think the Chairing of the convocation should be arranged?

9. The criteria for membership and procedures for admissions of new members are detailed in Article 2 of the CAETS Bylaws.

Section 3 Criteria for Membership. A member of CAETS shall:

- a. Be representative of the engineering and technological community of that country;
- b. Subscribe to the nonpolitical, non-governmental international character of the Council;
- c. Have a peer elected membership with criteria for election based on significant personal contributions to engineering, technological sciences, or related activities;
- d. Be governed by its elected membership;
- e. Be engaged in significant activities demonstrating that its objectives are compatible with the objectives of the CAETS; and
- f. Have sufficient financial support to pay the costs of CAETS membership and the costs of participation in CAETS activities.

Section 4 Procedures for Admission of New Members

- a. Applications for admission will normally be accepted for consideration no earlier than five years after the official date of establishment of the applicant.
- b. The election of a new member academy shall take place only during a regularly scheduled meeting of the Council when the Secretary/Treasurer receives completed application documents 90 days in advance of such meeting.
- c. Admission of a new member academy shall require the affirmative votes of at least all but one of the members' representatives present and voting.

d. Applicants elected by the Council, on complying with Council-approved entry requirements, shall be admitted to CAETS effective at the conclusion of the Council meeting at which elected.

- a) Do you think the criteria and procedures for membership should be revised?
- b) How do you think the criteria and procedures for membership could be revised?
- c) In the past, CAETS has responded in the negative to requests for membership from Academies with a strong engineering section but a wider remit than engineering. Do you think that such Academies should continue to be excluded from joining CAETS, and participating in CAETS activities?

Yes, they should be excluded from joining CAETS

Yes, they should be excluded from joining CAETS, but might be considered for participating in CAETS activities.

No, they should not be excluded from joining CAETS, and should apply for membership in the normal way

Don't know

- 10.a)** Do the ambitions of CAETS align with its capacity? *Capacity encompasses funding, human resources, and extent to which member academies are able to be involved.*

Thinking back to the CAETS Objectives and Priorities please indicate which of the following answers you most agree with.

- The ambitions of CAETS align well with its capacity
- The capacity of CAETS needs to be increased for CAETS to achieve its current ambitions. However, our Academy is unlikely to be able to increase its level of involvement in CAETS.
- The capacity of CAETS needs to be increased for CAETS to achieve its current ambitions. However, our Academy is unlikely to be able to increase its level of involvement in CAETS and would favour refinement of the Objectives and Priorities to reflect this.
- The capacity of CAETS needs to be increased for CAETS to achieve its current ambitions. Our Academy is likely to be willing to increase its level of involvement in CAETS to achieve its Objectives and Priorities.
- Our Academy would be willing to increase the capacity of CAETS through increased involvement, but this would be dependent on a refreshed Strategy.

b) How could CAETS achieve alignment between the scale of its ambitions and the level of resourcing? *Please consider that CAETS currently functions as a self-sustained federation, with member academy fees the primary and only source of income.*

c) Would you be willing to pay more to be a member of the CAETS?

Yes

No

Don't know

11. Considering your answer to question number 8, what more could CAETS do for your Academy and what more could your Academy do for CAETS?

12. Are there any additional comments you wish to make?