

Airspace and Noise Engagement Group – 22 April 2021

Attendees:	
Oliwia Chrzanowska - DfT (Secretary)	Richard Norman- LHR
Ian Elston- DfT (Chair)	Neil Robinson- MAG
Tim May- DfT	Martin Peachey- Community Groups
Ian Greene- DfT	Kay Jones- CAA
Matt Million- DfT	Darren Rhodes - CAA
Meera Sharma- DfT	Benjamin Fenech- PHE
Gary Marshall- DfT	Jeremy Pine- SASIG
Henry Bookham- DfT	Ben Hodgson- AICES
Teni Akinajo- DfT	Tim Johnson - AEF
Amal Said- DfT	Sam Hartley - ICCAN
Tim Cade - DfT	Paul Beckford - HACAN
Ryan Lock - DfT	Apologies:
Jack Millar -DfT	Andy Jefferson- Sustainable Aviation
Chris Cain - SASIG	Andy Kershaw- BA
Keith Bushell – Airbus	Colin Flack- UKACC – Chair of the UKACC
Vicki Hughes - ANS	Frank Evans- UKACC
Robin Clarke - NATS	Ian Jopson – NATS
Freddie Hopkinson - CBI	Amanda Francis - AICES
Charles Lloyd- Community groups	Steve Richardson – Virgin Atlantic
Rhian Thomas – DEFRA	Chris Carter - BA
Robert Smail - DEFRA	

Agenda item 1: Introductions

Ian Elston (IE) chaired the meeting. Introductions were made as well as acknowledging apologies from those not in attendance - David Silk, Director of the Airports, Infrastructure and Commercial Directorate sent his apologies, he was due to introduce himself to the ANEG group but will attend the next ANEG instead. IE introduced new joiners to the group - Paul Beckford of Heathrow Association for the Control of Aircraft Noise (HACAN), Vicki Hughes from Air Navigation Solutions (ANS), Darren Rhodes from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and Steve Richardson from Virgin Atlantic (who was unable to join the meeting).

IE noted that an agenda and papers were shared prior to this call and the group confirmed they had received them.

Agenda item 2: Minutes of last meeting and matters arising

IE then proceeded to list the three actions arising from the previous meeting

- 1) Invite DEFRA to today's meeting – completed, DEFRA were in attendance from 11am to present their agenda item
- 2) Question around whether work that CAA and ICCAN do is compatible and does not overlap – ICCAN review was undertaken and this question was covered within it. IE noted more on this would be covered under the ICCAN agenda item.
- 3) Members were asked to comment in writing on ANEG's Terms of Reference and potential sub-groups. IE explained that discussions had taken place with various ANEG members around ToR's and an agenda item was included later in this meeting to discuss in more detail.

IE asked for any further comments on minutes of the last meeting.

Martin Peachey (MP) asked whether a comment could be added to the previous minutes under item 9, emphasising the need for a suite of noise metrics to be used, which include an indicator of the number of noise events together with the noise level of each event. Amal Said (AS) confirmed this had been added. IE assured MP the revised minutes would be shared with him for sign off.

Agenda item 3: DfT Policy Updates

IE provided an update on the Global Travel Taskforce (GTT) – the Prime Minister commissioned the GTT to produce a second report into reopening the travel industry in alignment with the domestic COVID-19 roadmap. The report was published at the start of April and set out that international travel would resume no earlier than 17th May. A traffic light system of red, amber and green rated nations would be introduced nearer that date, likely to be based on the prevalence of the virus, local vaccine rollout and how effective the nation was at screening for new variants. IE added that further work was also being done around those arriving from high risk nations, who need to quarantine in hotels for 10 days. It has been announced that India was shortly to be added to the high-risk red list.

IE continued that the Strategic Framework for long term recovery of the sector was still being developed. This work was pushed back several times due to COVID-19 continued impact on the aviation sector. IE said the framework would now be published later this year. IE highlighted an HMT consultation on aviation tax reform (Air Passenger Duty), launched on 23rd March and closing 15th June. Attendees were encouraged to contribute or contact HMT if they had issues locating the consultation.

IE then gave an update on decarbonisation. BEIS confirmed this week they would include international aviation and shipping emissions in the Sixth Carbon Budget. New targets were to be enshrined in law before this Summer. IE confirmed that a Jet Zero Council Sustainable Fuels Delivery Group had been established and DfT would be consulting on net zero aviation strategy in coming months.

IE thanked those who responded to part one of the Night Flights Consultation, 950 responses were received and were being considered. DfT planned to respond in late July. IE reminded attendees that part 2 of consultation remains open until 31 May and encouraged all to respond.

IE then updated attendees on the ICCAN review. DfT had committed to undertake a review into ICCAN after two years of operation, as we had set out we would do in previous publications. IE thanked those who inputted. A draft version of the report had been received from reviewers and was being considered.

DfT announced funding for industry in March, to allow the airspace modernisation programme to continue. Funding was limited to £5.5 million and to just allowing airports to complete Stage 2 of the CAP1616 process. This funding was provided to CAA who will work with ACOG and airports in allocating the funding. Without funding the programme was at risk of grounding to a halt. When the programme moves to Stage 3 and beyond it'll revert to being paid for by industry. CAA's revised version of their aviation modernisation strategy is due towards the end of this year, following engagement with various parties and consultation.

Jeremy Pine (JP) asked a question on decarbonisation – AS confirmed to JP that the net zero aviation strategy is separate to the transport decarbonisation plan. Which one comes first and what degree of overlap will there be between them?

JP had a second query on the GTT – the traffic lights system means there are many elements that can change quickly, how can travellers be protected?

IE began by responding to JP's GTT point – there is a proposal to create a green “watchlist” so nations close to moving to amber could be monitored. This would be finalised over coming weeks. On JP's decarbonisation point IE clarified that JP was correct in saying there will be an aviation decarbonisation consultation. IE stated he would come back on the remainder of this point in writing.

Action - IE to come back on JP's decarbonisation point in writing

Charles Lloyd (CL) raised a question on night flights – has the government decided whether to roll over the current regime for two further years to 2024?

IE confirmed DfT were still considering consultation responses and no advice had yet been given to ministers, so it would not be appropriate to set out a position in this meeting. Gary Marshall (GM) reaffirmed this view. IE added that DfT have a legal requirement to publish by the end of July - so it would not be any later than this.

CL stressed that if the government did decide to rollover for two years, it would be disappointing to communities. Communities would be anxious to work with the department immediately after the decision, to set out what work would be done between July this year and the further consultation in 2022. CL stated there was a widespread belief among communities that much of this work should have been done post the 2017 consultation but hadn't been. Communities are keen to collaboratively work together to make sure that come the next consultation, there is a proper body of evidence to inform the department and future responders.

IE keen to work with communities and industry on how we take that forward and whether this group is the right place to do that in.

Chris Cain (CC) began by saying SASIG had recently had a helpful conversation with Ian Greene (IG) about the Systra model. Part of the response SASIG would provide to the current consultation would be around getting better and broader evidence on night noise health impacts. CC stated SASIG's view is that we need to move to a different metric based on the number of events. SASIG felt the Systra model could easily be rolled out to other airports. CC was of the view that it would allow the Department to get good quantitative analysis on different types of night flights and their economic value. CC queried whether it would be possible to revisit this and use the model as a basis for a better assessment of impacts of different types of night flights?

IG explained that a peer review took place of the Systra work and identified concerns about using it as it was, so it was not used in 2017.

Meera Sharma (MS) added that her team were reviewing previous work done with Systra, the peer review, responses to part 1 of consultation and other literature and evidence published since then to see how they could build on the previous piece of work. MS' team have a plan in place to complete this for the next regime.

CC asked if the department could share the plan with everyone when it was finalised? He noted it would be useful to understand how modelling was used, along with its shortcoming and benefits, to see how evidence that came out of it could best be used and interpreted.

Paul Beckford (PB) wished to know whether there was an update on when the SoNA night report could be expected?

IG responded that DfT had a meeting with the CAA and their Environmental Research and Consultancy Department (ERCD) on 21st April to try and understand the timeframe. DfT put it to peer review earlier this year and additional work was required. IG explained that the report was unlikely to be published before the

consultation close date of 31st May, but that DfT had only learnt this very recently. IG stated that no decisions had been made at this point

Action: IG to decide whether any action is needed as a result of SoNA report delay

IE asked PB to let DfT know if he thought this would cause issues with HACAN's ability to respond to the consultation?

MP raised two questions - one on the aviation policy strategic framework – when this comes out would it be in a traditional white paper format or a strategy paper, or are those the same thing? MP's other query was on the airspace modernisation programme and funding – MP highlighted that communities lacked funding to be able to look at technical aspects in detail and that Local Authorities may have the same problem – was there a source of funding communities could use that would help with this?

IE came back on MP's first point by stating that DfT were still considering exactly what format the framework would be published in. The intention initially was for it to be a high-level document which signposts future work. DfT would keep the group informed. On MP's airspace modernisation and funding point IE confirmed the Airspace Strategy Board agreed they would go away and work with community groups on issues like this. An initial meeting between DfT and community groups had taken place to discuss who should be involved and how that would feed into this group.

Agenda item 4: Community Updates

Charles Lloyd (CL) began by stating that a lot of the focus in communities was around airspace modernisation. While some groups could see benefit from modernisation, the overarching feeling was of concern. The additional capacity enabled by modernisation raised concerns around noise and emissions. Another concern was a fear of concentration of flightpaths enabled by PBN technology. CL welcomed work being done around addressing whether the policy and regulatory frameworks underpinning the modernisation process are adequate.

CL referred to MP's public funding point - community groups felt it was essential that a route was found to provide public funding to community groups near airports where changes were being proposed. CL felt strongly that the government should not fund stakeholders who stand to primarily benefit from modernisation (i.e. industry) without funding the communities most at risk of negative effects.

Community groups also suggested a series of other actions on organisation. For example, reviewing health impacts of PBN concentrated aircraft noise, reviewing WebTAG to ensure it had the right data in and an independent process to ensure consultation material was clear, as there had been recent examples where this was not the case. Community groups highlighted modernisation programmes from other nations – in particular the FAA next gen programme – as having important lessons to offer. Community groups were anxious for this to be investigated soon.

CL continued onto noise and health impacts. CL felt there was low confidence in the community about how research on health impacts gets translated into policy. CL also stated there was no systematic process in government for deciding how gaps in research could be filled. Community groups are keen to discuss a process where expert bodies (i.e. PHE, CAA, ICCAN etc) are formally commissioned to provide advice to the government, in a similar way that the CCC provides advice on climate issues. This would give communities confidence. CL was keen for IE's feedback on this.

Action: IE to provide feedback on CL's proposal for an expert body formal commissioning process

CL then covered noise policy and regulation – community groups believed it was time the government got serious on aircraft noise policy and regulation again, as it had been 2.5 years since Aviation 2050. Suggestions had been made by community groups on how to make Aviation 2050 proposals more effective but there was no subsequent action from government. Community groups felt there were failings in the current regulatory system. For example, the night flights consultation appeared to have come out late and work that could've been done since the last regime around economic benefits and health disbenefits of night flights has not been, several thousand dispensations were granted incorrectly and there was no systemic process to review if noise action plans were effective.

CL urged the government to start engaging properly to address the policy vacuum and to create an effective noise regulatory system. CL felt there should be a fresh process of engagement between policy makers and stakeholders, specifically communities. CL suggested an ANEG subgroup as an appropriate way to do this.

CL ended his presentation by covering proposals for a planning moratorium. Planning bodies state they take climate issues seriously but convince themselves that if they don't expand, someone else will, so they may as well. CL felt this was not a responsible position for the government to allow to continue, especially considering the inclusion of aviation emissions in the net zero budgets. CL felt it was impossible for a planning authority in this policy vacuum to know whether a decision it takes is consistent with government policy. CL proposed the government should impose a moratorium on airport planning decisions until there is a suitable policy position in place.

Neil Robinson (NR) responded to CL's point on airspace. This opens up options about how aircraft fly. One option was more concentration, those decisions are at the heart of CAP1616. NR disagreed on quantum and capacity – the quantum of operations and permission for airports to grow their level of traffic was not a question NR felt was for the airspace modernisation strategy. The land use planning system should be relied on to take these decisions as part of the local democratic process.

On the development of science, NR appreciated these points. NR felt it was helpful to see increasing and broader research making its way through to policy. NR's reservation was that due to the large attendance of the ANEG group, if subgroups were formed we were at risk of excluding stakeholders with legitimate interests. NR took a different view from CL on moratorium and emissions points.

Richard Norman (RN) reaffirmed that there was a lot of common ground between CL's comments and industry perspective. RN agreed there were gaps in WebTAG. RN supported NR's suggestion of being conscious of narrowing down the ANEG group, suggesting an alternative was needed to keep all voices in the conversation.

Robin Clarke (RC) asked if CL could expand on making consultations more accessible and an independent body for assessing this – could CL provide examples of what works well from a community perspective?

Ben Fenech (BF) began by saying DEFRA would be giving an IGCB(N) update in their agenda item and so this discussion would possibly be better suited there. BF clarified that IGCB(N) is one of the main mechanisms for translating noise evidence into policy. A conversation needs to be had around a formal group or framework on health impacts.

CC admitted he was sceptical about the idea of a policy moratorium; this approach is not taken in other areas. CC agreed with CL on the need for better evidence bases and stated he thought the absence of PPG24 had been a major problem. CC noted that until there is a better understanding of what new aviation technologies

can deliver, we shouldn't freeze. CC felt more work was needed from DfT to produce route maps that address the concerns being raised.

CL began by responding to BF's point – CL understood that research was being done but where communities saw a problem was when research comes to the policy maker – it is unclear what happens from that point onwards. On subgroups, CL explained they would be an effective way for smaller groups to get to grips with an issue and bring it back to ICCAN. CL felt it was hard to have effective conversations in a group as large as ANEG. On modernisation and capacity– modernisation is all about capacity, the way that capacity is created and used are two sides of same coin and should be addressed together. CL stated that the question of whether the planning system was able to release capacity properly needed to be further looked at. On consultations CL said ICCAN had produced consultation good practice documents and they could be useful in assessing whether documents are fit for purpose.

Tim May provided a DfT response – TM recognised CL's point of 2.5 years having passed since the green paper. TM was attracted to the idea of focus groups being used to take stock of what has changed, possibly similar to focus groups used for green paper development process.

Action: TM to consider focus groups

Agenda item 5: Industry updates

NR flagged Sustainable Aviation's noise studies at Gatwick and Manchester. The arrivals study at Gatwick was making good progress, less so the Departure study at Manchester as there was no flying programme of significant size to work with. This would pick up again over summer. NR warmly welcomed funding support for the airspace programme. NR mentioned an interesting pattern in complaints. Overall fewer complaints were being received, but instead a high volume of new and different complaints. MAG's view was that the amount of priority that stakeholders assign to noise had dropped markedly. MAG were not sure whether that is temporary or systemic. Sustainable Aviation were also looking at a response to part 2 of the night flights consultation.

RN added that the impact of Covid on aviation had been significant, but also provided a chance to pause and reflect on where industry is. RN was currently looking at how Heathrow engagement forums work and how to get the most out of them by undertaking stakeholder engagement sessions and seeking feedback. Later this year they would look at noise insulation strategy.

Keith Bushell (KB) continued that a focus for manufacturers had been the decarbonisation of aviation and the route to net zero. Airbus had outlined their route to net zero and were currently working on an update of Covid's impact on that, with the intention of sharing this later in 2021. KB clarified that decarbonisation work was not just around hydrogen and ZEROe – Airbus' concept zero-emissions aircraft. Fleet retirements of noisier and older aircraft are also taking place. The fleet penetration of new aircraft meant planes that are 15-20% more efficient and 20 -25% quieter were being introduced. Manufacturers are always looking at modifications for noise and fuel efficiency, there's an ongoing programme to improve on these. KB also explained the operational opportunities of airspace modernisation – the capability of aircraft is far greater than what they're currently able to do. Flying aircraft in slightly different ways has a significant impact. Manufacturers were also looking to update the Sustainable Aviation noise roadmap.

Robin Clarke (RC) noted that NATS' LAMP Deployment 1 was still going ahead. The consultation is scheduled to begin in August aimed primarily at industry but will be open to all to respond. Luton Arrival Route 1 consultation had just closed and was at CAP1616 stage 3D. RC announced that changes will be made as a result of the feedback received and communities have been listened to. RC touched on NR's complaints point

– NATS were also receiving different types of complaints, people seeing planes where they are not usually due to routing.

IE drew attention to a point PB raised on the call's chat function. PB – *"Promised noise reductions from the introduction of new aircraft or new engines are not always delivered in reality. As an example, at Luton new engines were supposed to deliver a 3dB decrease in noise and this did not happen because of the way the aircraft were flown."* IE stated he would be keen to pick up on this with PB offline.

Action: IE to pick up with PB on above point offline

Agenda Item 6: Break

Agenda Item 7: Noise and Health Updates – Kay Jones, CAA

Kay Jones (KJ) presented slides on the recently published CAA CAP 2113 report. The report covered research published between September 2020 to March 2021. KJ's presentation included studies that examined the relationship between sleep and health. For example Saucy et al's study into how aircraft noise related to cardiovascular death.

RN asked if KJ had seen evidence of new associations rather than differences in curves? Should we continuously repeat this kind of analysis as a priority, rather than looking into other aspects that don't appear to be being researched? KJ highlighted the increasing importance of non-acoustic factors – noise sensitivity, perceptions and attitudes etc and stated these will become more important as time goes on.

MP queried the 10dB reference in the Swiss study? Does this 10dB step have any significance in terms of health impacts and disturbance increasing markedly? KJ responded that 10dB is mentioned a lot across studies, especially in self-reported analysis.

BF added that 10dB is often used in noise and health studies as a reference step increase in exposure. It was just a way of representing the slope of an exposure-response relationship by a single number.

MP followed up by asking if KJ had looked into Thomas Wilson's work on CVD and hypertension? KJ said she believed this was included in the previous report.

CL returned to the proposition he made earlier in the meeting – Aviation Communities Forum does not see research being translated into policy. Communities would like assurances that a formal reporting process in this area to the department could be considered. CL suggested various oversight and regulatory bodies should get together to discuss and see whether it's a feasible proposition. If it is how could it be implemented?

TM responded by saying the upcoming update from DEFRA on IGCB(N) would be the best time to discuss this. New research comes out constantly and policy cannot be updated according to every new development. Research in other nations is also not always applicable here and the WHO had recommended that locally derived research should carry more weight.

Agenda item 8: ICCAN Update

Sam Hartley (SH) presented slides on recent ICCAN publications published on 18th March

ICCAN report on future of aviation noise management - government asked ICCAN to look at approach of enforcement and regulation generally.

Corporate strategy – ICCAN set a two-year corporate strategy upon which a work programme was based. Much of this was based on the autumn survey and focus groups carried out in Autumn 2020 – SH thanked those who contributed.

Autumn survey – the survey ran for 8 weeks, received 220 responses and consulted on future of aviation noise management, ICCAN's future vision and goals and ICCAN's performance to date.

Future of aviation noise management report – context was different from when ICCAN first formed – contexts: Covid issues – ICCAN's view was that Covid could provide a good opportunity for change. Complexity – the map of regulations and guidance is complex. ICCAN were trying to unpack this, make it clearer and more transparent. Competitiveness - ICCAN wanted the aviation industry's recovery to support an innovative and sustainable approach to noise management.

SH highlighted ICCAN's eight key areas of policy focus.

Recommendations – ICCAN's view was that they don't need to be an enforcement body as there are other mechanisms of enforcement out there, ICCAN should rather have statutory adviser status. Model akin to committee on climate change model. ICCAN also saw themselves becoming a statutory consultee on planning applications and airspace change proposals.

Corporate strategy – three-year strategy with work programme. Vision was now more granular than the one first consulted on. Four ambitions were set out.

SH presented ICCAN's three key goals: Setting Standards, Putting People's Health at the Heart of Aviation Noise Policy and Focus on the Future.

ICCAN keen to be engaged at this level through ANEG and bilateral work with stakeholders, hope to be working with government on night noise and recovery strategy when it comes out.

KB referred to goal three, KB keen to discuss offline what sort of input and engagement ICCAN would like from manufacturers?

Action: SH and KB to discuss

JP stated that local authorities fully value ICCAN's role in taking forward proceedings. On land use planning – what can ICCAN do to help local authorities with planning applications? Also, when Local Authorities begin looking at local plans, where should aviation noise exposure be treated in terms of site selection?

SH agreed with JP's points, one of many things made clear to ICCAN was importance of better guidance to Local Authorities in terms of setting local plans and decision making. SH was keen to work with JP and others on this.

MP stated the link between airspace planning and land use planning needs exploring, to bridge the gap between the two and enable people to make decisions on where they move.

Agenda item 9: DEFRA Update

Rhian introduced herself and her colleague Robert Smail, Rhian heads up the policy side of noise and statutory nuisance team at DEFRA. DEFRA intersect with ANEG on duties around the environmental noise directive and environmental noise regulations for England.

2021 Noise Mapping

DEFRA are required by law to map people's exposure to noise from roads, railways, airports, this happens on a 5-year cycle. Round 3 mapping published just over 2 years ago. 2021 is the year designated to collect round 4 data. How DEFRA work out how to make a proper assessment on aviation noise impact is difficult, as it's an unusual year. The model is currently being built to calculate road and rail noise. DEFRA are looking into the best way to approach aviation data to provide a representative picture.

Action: AS to circulate DEFRA slides

Intergovernmental Group on Costs and Benefits (Noise)

RS presented an overview of IGCB(N) work – the group is DEFRA led and cross governmental, provides advice and economic evaluation of the impact of environmental noise in the UK. IGCB(N) helps develop government's understanding of costs and benefits of reducing noise pollution, as well as making recommendations on the noise sources and health impacts that should be included in policy appraisals. Since being reconvened the IGCB(N) had been assessing the extent of new evidence. To do this there were two systematic reviews: first looked at evidence related to environmental noise exposure and annoyance, sleep disturbance, cardiovascular and metabolic health outcomes. Second looked at effects of environmental noise on mental health, wellbeing, quality of life, cancer, dementia, birth, reproductive outcomes and cognition. Findings of both have been published in report form and in peer reviewed journals. Next step was to commission a succession of studies to update exposure response relationship areas shown in these reviews, but this had been delayed due to Covid - will hopefully continue soon.

NR agreed 2021 is probably not an appropriate baseline. For the next cycle of the noise action plan, NR is really focused on how much weight is given to noise impacts at different levels. When we receive guidance on this can it be as clear as possible, consistent with the work of DfT and reflective of what we've heard this morning on emerging research?

PB asked if an update could be provided on when the work will be ready and published? Also, can aviation noise be specifically included in models too?

RT explained that the process of collating data is different for aviation than for road and rail but would be put into the model. Previous maps are all available and searchable and this was the intention with the new ones. RT confirmed maps would be completed sometime in 2022 and signed off by end of 2024. It would however be down to airports and their engagement groups to take forward the actions, not DEFRA.

IE questioned how useful the mapping would be in light of such an unusual year? Is there scope to consider a delay?

RT responded by saying that DEFRA would look at what could be done to adjust the legal requirement and possibly extrapolate data from parts of the year which are more typical, or by looking at different times. RT stressed that it is DEFRA's intention to produce relevant data.

CL questioned the usefulness of mapping data. CL's personal view was that the actions that airports take are more relevant. CL highlighted defects in the noise action plan process. Are noise action plans achieving the objectives of the directorate? CL encouraged DEFRA to think more "bottom up". Communities keen to engage in that process

RT explained that environmental noise regulations which legislate for this derive from the Environmental Noise Directive (END). There had been an expectation from some that the UK can walk away from that due to EU Exit, but it's in national legislation in England and the devolved nations. It would take a process of going through primary legislation to make amendments. DEFRA are dependent on this being a ministerial priority - until now it hasn't been. Parliamentary queue had been impacted by Covid and EU Exit so no promises could be made about wholesale changes to legislation. The matter is however on DEFRA's radar and they were keen to discuss tweaks to existing legislation.

CL stated he did not feel IGCB(N) should be the mechanism for how health evidence synthesises into policy and that it doesn't seem DEFRA are the right people to advise DfT on this. CL was keen to have a proper discussion on the proposal given by his group.

RT agreed there was scope for discussion. RT highlighted that the IGCB(N) is an interdepartmental group and tries to draw expertise from as widely as possible. PHE are a key component in this.

BF emphasised that the last time this process happened the IGCBN considered the review, commissioned research, published a report and that report fed into WebTAG and the Treasury's Green Book. BF felt this represented a clear pathway. This time the issue was that Covid slowed the process. IGCBN carried out two systematic reviews in the meantime and this should provide reassurance that action is happening.

RS noted that while the delay has been frustrating, DEFRA were now able to include additional studies due to the time delay.

SH was interested to hear on a webinar that the EU was planning to review whether the END was fit for purpose and reflected the balanced approach. SH wondered what exactly the EU were doing with END?

RN confirmed the EU study would last approx. 6-10 months. The END would be a process to pull together an action plan. The noise action plan is the delivery mechanism for the actions arising from the balanced approach. RN added that objectives are not currently clear enough for all stakeholders to understand, they need to be clearer and measurable.

MP reflected on 2019, when the mapping was from 2016 and community reps, the aviation environment federation and DEFRA attended a meeting where they ran through the things Richard just mentioned. MP asked what are the outcomes of an eventual NAP? MP stated it would be helpful if community reps can meet with DEFRA to go through this in early stages. MP also noted that noise mapping determines the no. of people seriously affected by noise, it should not matter which year is mapped as long as something representative is produced. MP also wished to know if DEFRA were still using 55Lden and if so, why?

RT stated that she'd take this to evidence colleagues. From memory a range of different levels were used last time. Previously DEFRA had modelled exactly to the requirements of the regulations and this meant that funding had been allocated purely for what is required by law. This time DEFRA have the go ahead to build something that lasts longer, is more fit for purpose and can assess different scenarios.

IE thanked Rhian and hoped DEFRA could join future meetings.

Agenda item 10: Review of ANEG Membership and Terms of Reference

TM led this item and hoped to tie up the discussion at last ANEG about ToR's and membership. Some further feedback had been received on this via bilateral meetings with some members since the last ANEG meeting. A proposal last time was to consider a sub-group to bring this work together, but TM believed there was not sufficient interest or suggestions to need a subgroup. DfT were open to any further comments on how to improve ANEG.

TM ran through questions to be considered:

It was agreed that ANEG was still considered useful and the current aim is accurate. It was agreed the meeting should remain 2-3 hours and be hybrid even when back in office to allow those outside of London to easily attend. It was agreed ANEG should be held 3 times a year.

Membership of group – TM noted that the General Aviation seat had not been filled since the start of ANEG. Thus, the general aviation seat would be removed and a dedicated meeting relevant to GA could take place if this was thought to be of use. Suggestions had been received to invite devolved administrations – TM confirmed they would be approached once their respective pre-election periods end.

Observers: DfT had received requests for observers at ANEG. DfT suggested occasional guests would be ok if they have an important update. However, JP said ANEG should not always have an audience. RN agreed and stated the importance of trust between members so more in-depth conversations could be had. CL expressed his frustration with ANEG's lack of action, and suggested subgroups to focus on this. TM agreed and stated one off items and guests could help here too.

CC suggested exposing more Senior Civil Servants and ministers to this meeting for an inside look – could that be organised? CC added that if the GA slot is not being used could we get a smaller, regional airport rep in? The issues they face on noise will be different to those faced by larger airports who are well represented here.

Action: DfT to consider more SCS, ministerial, regional airport and Devolved Administration attendance at ANEG

MP felt the group that DfT pulled together brings together a wealth of experience and information. MP agreed with the idea of focus groups or a subgroup to increase outcomes of the group

Action: Agreement that we should not allow observers, amend ToR's to reflect this.

Agenda item 11: AOB

IE gave one further government update - the ATMUA bill went through the House of Lords on 16 April and is onto royal assent stage. IE will keep the ANEG group updated on this.

IE asked for thoughts on dates of next ANEG meeting – first half of July agreed on.

Action: DfT to check attendee availability and send selection of dates out.

No other business from others

IE thanked everyone for joining, contributing and engaging. IE was happy to see good representation from government, communities, airports and industry. IE was grateful for the open, frank and honest discussions

that took place. IE confirmed minutes for this meeting would be written up and circulated to attendees shortly, along with any actions.