

Airspace and Noise Engagement Group – 5 May 2022

Ian Elston - DfT (Chair)	Benjamin Fenech - UKHSA	David Courtenay – Northern Irish Government
Tim May – DfT	Cerise Reynolds – DEFRA	Prof. Charlotte Clark – St. George's University
Ian Greene - DfT	Neil Robinson - MAG	Athanasios Synodinos - Airbus
Gary Marshall - DfT	Rick Norman – LHR	Vicki Hughes – Air Navigation Solutions (ANS)
Amal Said - DfT	Martin Peachey- Community Groups	Ben Hodgson – AICES
Kieran O'Shea - DfT	Paul Beckford- Community Groups	Rob Griggs – Airlines UK
Matt Million - DfT	Tim Johnson (AEF)	Robin Clarke - NATS
Carolyn Crawford – DfT	Christopher Snelling- Airport Operators Association	
Ruhana Begum - DfT	Chris Cain - SASIG	
Abigail Grenfell - CAA	Andrew Lambourne - LADACAN	
John Burton - CAA	Frank Evans – UKACC	
Darren Rhodes - CAA	Paula Street - UKACC	

Attendees

Agenda

TIME	ACTIVITY
09:30-09:35	Introductions
09:35-09:40	Minutes of last meeting and matters arising
09:40-10:10	DfT policy updates, to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airspace modernisation • Aviation Strategic Framework • Aviation De-Carbonisation • Night flights
10:10-10:55	Aviation night noise study – Professor Charlotte Clark
10:55-11:05	Break
11:05-11:35	Community and Industry updates
11:35-11:55	CAA Update- Health Studies- Darren Rhodes
11:55-12:25	CAA Update – progress on taking on some of the former functions of ICCAN
12:25-12:30	AOB

Introduction

- Ian Elston (IE) chaired the meeting and introductions were made and apologies from those not in attendance were acknowledged.
- IE handed over to Tim May (TM) to discuss the minutes from the previous meeting. TM noted and apologised that DfT had not yet sent out the minutes due to the previous secretary leaving. TM ran through a quick recap of those minutes: DfT policy updates, focus groups, night flights, CAA process of taking on ICAAN's role, community and industry updates, CAA publications and a SASIG update on land use planning.
- TM mentioned an action from the last meeting: Chris Cain (CC) had asked for a follow up meeting with the Department for Levelling up Housing and Communities (DLUHC). CC stated that DLUHC had wanted him to detail everything he wanted from them before the meeting, and suggested DfT could talk to them regarding this. TM mentioned that DfT would be interested in joining the meeting and that DfT will contact DLUHC with a view to arranging this.

DfT Updates

- IE provided updates on four items:
 - Focus groups - DfT have undertaken five focus groups on issues related to night flights, overall noise policy, regulatory measures and enforcement, air quality and the health impacts of aviation noise. Aiming to consult in late 2023 on a new night flight regime to commence in 2025 (following the announcement last year that the existing regime is to be rolled over from October 2022 to October 2025).
 - Airspace modernisation – which included work on CAA review of strategy consultation, ACOG iteration 2 Masterplan, funding to sponsors for this financial year and electronic conspicuity.
 - Aviation strategic framework – Currently developing aviation strategic framework which we will focus on the next 10 years. There will be engagement with interested stakeholders, and this will outline Government's key priorities. There is not a date yet, but the aim is for publication before the summer.
 - Jet zero aviation decarbonisation – last year DfT published the jet zero consultation which sets out a vision for aviation to reach jet zero by 2050. This closed in September 2021, with over 3000 responses. Following this a further technical consultation was launched, which closed on the 25th April. DfT are aiming to publish the Jet Zero strategy later this year.
- IE wanted to bring attention to the Ukraine – Russia conflict which has had an impact on the aviation industry. The UK was one of the first countries to ban all Russian

traffic from our airspace. Following this, Russia banned all UK traffic over their airspace. This doesn't have a huge impact on traffic over the UK, but we have seen a change in the airspace. There has been a lot of work on this recently and IE apologised for any delays in responses due to the focus on this.

DfT Updates: Questions

- Tim Johnson (TJ) welcomed the five thematic discussions at the focus groups and found some of them especially useful. In terms of next steps, it would be useful if we had 5 or 6 key points from the groups so we can see what to take forward and prioritise. TJ asked whether DfT could take on this task?
- TM replied that each of the five focus groups have had minutes taken and mentioned that the top five points could be subjective for each stakeholder. TM suggested that we could summarise the paper, what we have learnt, things that need further discussion and bits that we missed.
- TJ thanked TM for his point and didn't think there would be consensus but, thought it would be interesting to know the key takeaways that appealed to each group. We could then see if there is need for further discussion groups and see areas where there isn't consensus. This could help with prioritisation, as we could map it out and return to it at future ANEG meetings.
- Paul Beckford (PB) asked if the next piece of research mentioned at the last ANEG on night flights, will be ready to inform the next consultation? PB also mentioned that the CAA's new environmental panel is looking at a survey of noise attitudes and wondered if this will have made enough progress to be in the next night-time consultation?
- TM replied that we can pick up on these bits later as they will be covered in the agenda.
- Neil Robinson (NR) mentioned the progress around the Jet Zero Council, future aircraft types and the optimism around Hydrogen. NR wondered if these could feature in this group as an agenda item, as he believed it would be welcomed by members. IE replied that he would be happy to add this as an agenda item if members agree.
- TJ welcomed NR's suggestion and suggested that if we have electric and hydrogen propulsion sessions in future ANEG, it would be good to focus on the noise impacts.
- Paula Street (PS) wanted to seek clarification on the review of Noise Action Plans (NAP). Understands strategic noise mapping is being undertaken at the moment and being based on 2021 traffic levels. What guidance is being given to airports from DfT or DEFRA and how does this translate into a review of the NAP?
- Cerise Reynolds (CR) replied that DEFRA are talking to airports about the data they are providing regarding the NAP and taking a light touch approach updating the guidance. Looking to get this out to airports shortly.

- PS asked for clarification on what a light touch approach would be? PS stated that the strategic mapping may not reflect the position of airports if based on 2021, since aviation is bouncing back quickly. PS also asked when DEFRA sends guidance to airports if they could copy in consultative committees.
- CR asked if she could have PS's details so she can copy her into emails sent to airport operators. DEFRA have not decided exact changes to the NAP, they are making light touch changes, but cannot provide any detail now. CR will get back when the information is available.
- Ian Greene wanted to reassure PS that DfT have been speaking to DEFRA and agreed that basing a NAP on 2021 traffic levels would not be beneficial to anybody. When the guidance comes out it needs to reflect the legislation, but also have a common-sense approach.
- IE asked CR if they have a sense of time scale on the guidance. IE also asked PS whether it would be useful to have a meeting to talk through and take questions on the guidance when it comes out.
- CR replied that they are looking to get the NAP guidance circulated shortly.
- PS responded that this would be helpful, particularly for the airports required to produce NAPs.

Aviation night noise study – Professor Charlotte Clark

- Charlotte Clark (CC) from St George's University London introduced herself and began by mentioning the bodies that will be part of this study: DfT, St George's University London, NatCen (social researchers), Noise Consultants Ltd and the University of Pennsylvania.
- This will be a two study approach:
 - Social survey – On a large group of residents who live near eight UK airports. The aim is to assess associations of aviation noise exposure and subjective sleep disturbance and annoyance.
 - Objective sleep disturbance study – Taking physiological measurements, recording sleep for a one-week period and assessing associations of aviation noise exposure and objective sleep disturbance.
- The provisional timings of the study:
 - Currently in phase 1.
 - Phase 2 will commence shortly and throughout the rest of the year (2022). Undertaking the social survey and a feasibility study.
 - Phase 3 will begin next year (2023), it will involve the main objective sleep study.
 - Phase 4 will include analysing the data from the objective sleep study into 2024/25.
- CC set out the four key aims of the study:

- To estimate the association of night aviation noise on subjective sleep disturbance and annoyance for a sample of residents living near UK airports using a range of time-average metrics (LAeq 8h, LAeq T, N60, overflights) for different time-periods between 22.00-08.00 hours.
 - To examine if the effects of night aviation noise on subjective sleep disturbance and annoyance differ by area-level socioeconomic deprivation, age, gender, ethnicity, noise sensitivity, and pre-existing illness. A large sample size should allow this analysis.
 - To estimate the association of night aviation noise on objective sleep disturbance (awakenings) for a sample of residents living near UK airports using a range of time-average metrics (LAeq 8h, LAeq T, N60, overflights) and event-based metrics (LAm_{ax}, SEL) for different time-periods between 22.00-08.00 hours.
 - To use the evidence from the study to conduct a series of cost valuations to inform discussions of updates to the TAG methodology for assessing noise and health.
- CC explained this will be a push to web survey which is predominantly taken online. Addresses will be selected, and people will be sent an invitation letter, and per household 2 adults are able to participate. They will also be sent a paper questionnaire in case they prefer this method. The questionnaire should only take 20 minutes.
- The survey will use established and standardised questions that have been used on previous national noise surveys, to ensure continuity and comparability where possible.
 - Survey key content: Noise annoyance, subjective sleep disturbance, noise mitigation, non-acoustic factors, sociodemographic and household factors, health status and consent to be contacted about the objective sleep disturbance study and any future research.
 - Key outcomes from the survey: The 'percentage highly annoyed' (%HA), mean annoyance scores, self-reported sleep disturbance (%HSD (Highly Sleep Disturbed)) and Self-reported sleep quality.
- CC explained that the sample is purposive, meaning they have deliberately chosen airports for the study. This ensures they have a range of airports that have different characteristics and data they need to undertake the study. The disadvantage is that inferences about the relationship between exposure metrics and sleep will be limited to the selected airports. The alternative was to randomly select airports, but this has its own set of disadvantages, such as not having a large number of people exposed.
 - 8 airports have been selected: Bristol, East Midlands, Gatwick, Glasgow, Heathrow, Luton, Manchester and Stansted.

- These airports were selected to include a range of characteristics including number of movements; freight/passenger flights; urban/rural; night-time restrictions; night quota; distribution of flights during the night-time; population exposed.
- The study hopes to achieve a sample of 4,000 people who are exposed to aircraft noise at night. To get to this number they started at 15,000 and expect 22% of people to respond. This assumes that 60% will return online and 40% on paper.
- CC mentioned that the survey is led by NatCen who specialise in conducting national surveys of this type. They have assumed the 22% response rate and they have a lot of experience in the push to web methodology. They will maximise response by sending clear reminders and a £10 incentive. CC added that there is also a phone number they can call, and the survey will be simple to complete.
- CC stated that every household which completes the survey will have noise modelling at the address. This will be based on flight track data. While the social survey is going on, there will be a limited validation of measure of sound at each airport, the modelling will be in line with CAP 2091.
- The objective sleep disturbance study – the aim of this is to link a range of metrics to sleep disturbance. People will be recruited into this from the cross-sectional survey if they agree to be contacted further.
- CC stated that the study will build on existing studies and methods that are available and will be the first objective study on sleep disturbance for 30 years. The methods are based on the American study on aviation noise conducted by Dr Basner. He is on the study team and his methodology is currently being employed by the Federal Aviation Authority (FAA). CC went on to mention the Faros devices which reliably capture ECG and actigraphy data for the scoring of noise-induced awakenings.
- Once people have been checked for eligibility, they will be sent a box which will contain everything they need for the study. The Faros device will be worn for seven days, Monday-Sunday. In that time, they will model aircraft noise exposure for that person via track data. Inside the box is also a sound level meter which the participants will turn on before they go to sleep. Each morning the participant will answer a brief questionnaire on how they slept that night. At the end of the period they will mail all the equipment back and receive a payment of £120.
- CC mentioned that since the study is over a week period and they are hoping to get around 170 people, it will create a lot of data. To help with this, they will use a validated automatic algorithm which can tell if people have had an awakening. The primary outcome will be the sleep fragmentation index, which is the number of awakenings someone has per hour of sleep.
- Phase 2 – the team will conduct a feasibility study on around 30 individuals. They will be testing their instructions, response rates, collection of data and the processes for shipping of equipment. They will also be checking if they can link event-based metrics to the physiological data, as this part of the study is innovative.
- Phase 3/4 – if the feasibility study suggests they can proceed with a larger study, they would collect data from a further 140 people. They would collect data from 20

people per month and the data processing would happen throughout phase 3 and 4. The ultimate aim is to come up with exposure response functions for different periods of the night time for time and event based metrics. This would also feed into the health economic analysis.

- Timelines for reporting – Results from the social survey including health economic analyses would be reported in summer 2023. For the objective sleep disturbance survey, the feasibility study would be reporting in summer 2023, but this would only report on if it meets the criteria to proceed. The results from the objective sleep disturbance study including health economic analyses would be reported in 2025.

Discussion

- IE thanked CC for her presentation, mentioning there is a lot of work going on and opened the floor to questions.
- Frank Evans (FE) asked about non-aviation noise, mentioning that in the summer season windows would be open and there would be many sources of noise. How would the team cover this?
- CC replied that in the questionnaire it will ask if they had their window open. Regarding other noise, they will be able to link the noise to the noise track data, they would know if other events happened and if they were woken by these other events.
- Robin Clarke (RC) wondered about eliminating any elements of self-selection and if a postal invite and £10 incentive was enough. He also asked if the anticipated response rate of 22% is high, as you can normally expect around 10% for postal. Lastly, RC was concerned of getting a representative sample and asked how the sample size was selected.
- CC replied that they are looking at noise exposure around each airport. CC wanted to emphasise that will also go down to low exposure levels, to cover a broad range of levels. Once they have mapped the areas and exposures, they will randomly select addresses. The 22% is informed from recent national surveys which have been using push to web, which is why they don't think it is overly ambitious.
- RC thanked CC and agreed that since Covid the percentage has probably been pushed up, but still thinks it is a bit high. RC still had concerns that the postal method does not minimise the barriers to entry and self-selection.
- CC also explained how they got the number for the people in the objective sleep study. Calculations were done, estimating how many people they would need to show a certain effect. The number was informed by the amount needed for statistical analysis.
- Martin Peachey (MP) thanked CC for the presentation and mentioned his support of event based metrics, but had a few questions to raise: Is this a replacement for SoNA

sleep work? Are they are going to measure background noise as a metric? Will the study look at performance the following day? And will the study be repeated?

- CC replied that the event-based metrics are key here which is why we are keen to have them. They should be able to look at background noise, as the survey and meters will be able to validate the model. They know communities feel this is important, so will pass comments to noise team. The study will not be able to measure people's performance the next day, it will ask how refreshed they feel, but this will not be linked to performance. Regarding the study being repeated, they will ask people if they can contact them again. At the moment there isn't any funding or plans, but it's not ruled out.
- IE continued this point mentioning that the contract is for this piece of work. DfT need to consider whether it is worth repeating, considering how it went and value for money etc. IE addressed the SoNA sleep query, stating that this is not a replacement, DfT are considering how to take it forward with the work the CAA will be doing.
- Andrew Lambourne (AL) asked about the study's ability to correlate if a particular noise event was an aircraft and if the awakening was caused by this. AL also wondered if unintended awakenings could be caused by other factors such as undetected sleep apnoea. AL raised a point about social economic and geographic spread. How wide of a spread will the sample be, if generally speaking, the people who live by airports have no choice due to financial restraints. AL also wanted to make a point about the hazard of winds changing and the effect this could have on the study.
- CC started off addressing sleep apnoea. As part of the social survey, they will ask health questions which are used to exclude people. Using this the team will try to keep a control on who goes into the study, if they found out during the study someone had sleep apnoea, they would inform the person and advise them to go to their GP. CC then addressed the spread around the airports and that because they want to plot exposure response functions, they will go down to lower levels. They are aiming for a wide range of levels, which should cover all the groups that AL mentioned.
- NR believed it is a good sample of medium to large airports but thought it doesn't capture operations by helicopters and general aviation. NR raised this as he believes we will see the proliferation of drones and other new aircraft types. Any information that linked these operations to health, sleep and general annoyance would be useful, but wouldn't be captured by the study as it is currently designed. NR also mentioned that the response rate looks optimistic, it assumes 78% of people who are invited to opt in would decline to do so. NR thought it's likely that people who are more impacted by noise are more likely to take part, inherently building a bias. From MAG's experience when they have done various consultations and they use opt in, it tends not to reflect well in some demographics such as young people, women, and people of colour. In response to this, MAG have decided to take more

of an active involvement, so they can get a good cross section. Overall, NR is concerned that they don't build enough into the sampling strategy which then means the outcome doesn't carry the confidence of all the stakeholders.

- CC replied that they have excluded airports with helicopters as they didn't want to include these in the sample. CC agreed that these studies would be useful for drones, but for these new technologies they need to have their own studies and not use helicopters as evidence. Regarding response rates, the survey will be presented in a neutral way. The team have decided not to mention noise to avoid creating a bias. Only when you consent and are in the survey, will you be asked about those things. CC mentioned that she would pass NR's concerns about these groups on to NatCen. They don't think an opt in survey will introduce bias, but they will be able to compare the sample they receive against census data to check that.
- NR thanked CC for her comments and thought we should keep the conversation going. He believed there is a hunger from all stakeholders to have more subjective and objective information. NR is keen that as much as it is achievable for all the stakeholders to have strong confidence in the survey and to contribute.
- Athanasios Synodinos (AS) wanted to let CC know if they can support the team in any way as manufacturers to let them know. AS asked if it is more straight forward to link self-reported sleep disturbance or annoyance with non-acoustic factors and wondered about physiological data, can this be linked to non-acoustic factors or is it harder? AS also mentioned, that they are interested in event-based metrics. Most self-impacts are linked through response curves which are based on average sound metrics. Do they plan to develop something based on event-based metrics?
- CC responded that they hope to get exposure response functions for event-based metrics, it's one of the key advantages of measuring objective sleep. They will also do event-based metrics, for the subjective reports on annoyance. CC continued that there's no reason they can't link physiological data and non-acoustic factors, if they measure some of the non-acoustic factors they can see if it influences the number of awakenings. CC will take this away and discuss with the team, as they are currently designing the morning questionnaires.
- Paul Beckford (PB) asked for some clarity on the dB levels they will be going down to and the distance they will be going from airports. PB also wondered about communities overflowed from multiple airports and if the study would be able to distinguish between them. As well as if they could distinguish aircraft so they can identify aircraft or airlines that are particularly bad. PB also asked if they are including mental health questions on the survey, as some people are triggered by aircraft noise. Finally, PB enquired if the study will ask if the candidates have had any double glazing or any other mitigation, so we can distinguish between interventions airports have delivered that have helped.
- CC replied that they are putting questions in the survey to ask if people have had insulation or any other type of mitigation as part of an airport scheme. CC explained that they don't have questions on mental health, but they do have the mental

wellbeing scale, which is a standard measure that was in SoNA. They will take this point away and have a think. In terms of exposure to multiple airports, they will have to build into their strategy. CC mentioned they want to go down to the lowest levels they can and can't give an answer now as they're still going through the data.

- BF commented on the representativeness of the survey. Asking if it is more representative to have a survey of 400 respondents with a 50% response rate, with in person interviews, or a survey of 4000 responses with a 22% response rate. BF then asked CC if there will be any initiatives, such as a non-response analysis or picking a few people who declined and determine if they vary in characteristics to those who responded?
- CC responded that she would go back to NatCen and ask, as it is hard in a postal survey, to compare those who participated with those who didn't. CC mentioned that the feedback on representation has been extremely useful.
- IE thanked CC for presenting and mentioned that the slides would be shared.

Community Updates

- Tim Johnson (TJ) gave this update on behalf of communities.
- TJ stated that he was picking up a lot of the work that Charles Lloyd (CL) started in CL's absence. They have been responding to the CAA's AMS consultation. This has been a point of frustration for them as they have been expecting a lot from the CAA which has not yet been delivered. For example, they were expecting the sustainability panel by April as well as a clearer insight into how the CAA intend to carry out their work and functions.
- They have also been expecting DfT to inform them of how the other ICCAN functions that the CAA are not responsible for are being taken forward.
- Therefore, instead of responding to the CAA's consultation, they have written a letter to the CAA and DfT to gain more clarity on this matter. A wider sense of policy objectives is needed in order to answer specific questions by the CAA or DfT.
- Additionally, TJ noted that he feels that they have communicated a lot with DfT but it is now important to see the follow up work being done and actions.
- TJ noted that he would like to hear from CAA representatives regarding where they are with the sustainability panel.
- Andrew Lambourne (AL) stated that there is an ongoing process of consultation due to airports applying for expansion of capacity and airspace change. AL felt that there is a strong sense of policy being out of date or inadequate and urged more focus on specific guidance. AL would like to see a roadmap to get policy back on track based on outcomes of focus groups.

- Regarding airspace change, AL notes that there is a difficulty here as an issue has been identified but no solution to solve this issue. This is due to airports sharing airspace, how can both achieve continuous climb?
- Martin Peachey (MP) stated that in one of focus groups it was suggested that using PBN efficiently could provide alternate routes and provides times for respite. Can this also solve the above issue mentioned by AL?
- Paul Beckford (PB) discussed funding. He noted that it has been mentioned that industry have received 1 billion pounds for various initiatives and would like to see communities receiving a proportion of that to allow them to get the best possible advice in future.
- Ian Elston (IE) responded on the sustainability panel point and stated that the CAA could pick this up in their session later on.

Industry Updates

- Neil Robinson (NR) gave the update on industry. He stated that industry had seen some traffic recovery last autumn. However, the new covid variant and travel restrictions then negatively impacted this recovery.
- However, industry is looking forward to rapid recovery this summer and expect closer to 2019 levels. However, this recovery has been faster than expected which has led to some operational issues, cancellations and delays.
- Industry welcomes the Jet Zero Council and the decarbonisation plan. They are optimistic in the potential of sustainable fuels and are trying to find evidence for this.
- In September, the ICAO general assembly will take place. Industry believe that this is a global solution for climate change as an international goal would be agreed.
- IE asked whether it would be helpful to have a paper on all the sponsors and what stage they are at to keep ANEG members updated
- Paula Street (PS) asked if it would be possible to have all the studies/trials around airports compiled into one paper. This would be helpful to ensure airports are able to learn from each other rather than repeating similar trials. NR stated that he would be happy to take this as an action for Sustainable Aviation.
- Tim Johnson (TJ) asked if ANEG should also be used to update on decarbonisation, if so, he is happy to update on this more in future. IE confirmed that ANEG should focus on noise but sometimes both noise and decarbonisation must be considered as they can impact each other.

CAA Update- Darren Rhodes

- DR gave an update on CAP2328. This covered research from September 2021- March 2022 and included annoyance, cardiovascular disease, children and cognition.
- The next report is due to end in September 2022.

- DR referred to studies on each of the topics mentioned above.
- It was found that due to a short-term reduction in noise exposure due to Covid-19 lockdown, a significant decrease in arterial stiffness was found. This is important as this shows that some conditions can be reversed/reduced with less noise disturbance.

Discussion

- Paul Beckford (PB) asked when we can have a discussion on the findings following the focus group on health and evidence. PB questioned how the Department formally considers this evidence.
- IG stated that there was a large amount of discussion, the department is going to be going through these and then considering next steps. TM agreed that there is a lot of information to keep on top of including studies focused on airports outside of the UK, but these studies are still relevant.
- Benjamin Fenech (BF) stated that this presentation was useful as it provides a snapshot of emerging topics.
- Rick Norman (RN) stated that it is important to discover where the common areas of interest are among ANEG and then conduct more studies on that.
- IE stated that it may be worth doing this in a subgroup and then having this subgroup give updates at following ANEG meetings.
- RN and PB expressed interest in joining this subgroup.
- Andrew Lambourne (AL) suggested looking at worldwide data to assess the effect of airspace change and continuous climb, building on a previous exercise completed by NATS some time ago, and to use real world data accumulated during COVID in less busy airspace.
- DR said this is something the CAA have been looking at, due to the opportunity presented by COVID. This is transforming into a wider piece on noise vs carbon. DR will take this away for further discussion, but there is some work already which could be presented to ANEG.
- Martin Peachey (MP) spoke about focus groups; he did not feel that they had discussed the issue of research evidence. He fears that we will never resolve the issue if we keep waiting on research. He suggested formulating policy which can then be modified if the evidence suggests this.
- PS mentioned that regarding continuous climb research, it may be useful to share studies with ANEG so that airports do not conduct the same studies and instead build on previous studies and identify and fill in the gaps.

CAA Update – progress on taking on some of the former functions of ICCAN

- John Burton (JB) and Abigail Grenfell (AG) from the CAA updated on the work that has been going on in setting up the CAA's sustainability team.
- They explained that part of the CAA's purpose is to provide assistance and advice to the DfT to enable the department to take informed decisions on aviation noise policy.
- JB talked through the Work Programme including:
 - Upcoming Strategy – this is not just about noise, but looking at sustainability much wider, looking at carbon and air quality as well. Aiming to publish towards the end of May.
 - Environmental Sustainability Panel – disappointed to not yet have this up and running, as there have been a few issues and a requirement to ensure that none of the panel members work for those regulated by the CAA. The role of Chair of the panel has now been offered but can not yet announce the name, but will hopefully be signed off in the next few days. The membership of the panel, along with the Strategy will hopefully be announced by the end of May.
 - Positions within the sustainability team are also being recruited – 8 posts to fill and expected to be up and running in June.
- The link was posted to the CAA webpage which details the CAA noise advisory functions, which has an indicative workplan for the 2022/2023 programme of work. [CAA noise advisory functions | Civil Aviation Authority](#)
- JB talked through the workplan highlights
 - Transition of ICCAN functions to the CAA and transfer of records – now pretty much complete. Expect to complete by the end of May.
 - Aviation Noise Attitudes Survey (ANAS) – work is progressing, with the CAA having been reviewing data that has come across from ICCAN, and discussions have been held with counterparts at the FAA. As ICCAN had planned to do, the CAA have now commissioned a sampling consultant, and hope to appoint a delivery partner for ANAS later this year.
 - The team are starting to scope out annualised reports on noise (and on carbon).
 - There is a piece of work on Trade-offs, for example, if we were to make an adjustment to improve a carbon footprint, what would be the impact on noise?
 - Review of the ICCAN toolkit – the CAA want to take forward the good things ICCAN did previously.
- In short, the team have a busy few months ahead, getting the team established and the right people in post. Once positions are filled, the expectation is that the workplan should accelerate quickly.
- Andrew Lambourne (AL) asked if the review of the ICCAN toolkit will cover best practice for consultations, and asked how this would feed through to an update of CAP1616A? JB agreed to take this question away and respond to the group.

- IE recognised that the toolkit is a vital tool to stakeholders, to assist sponsors, and for those being consulted upon. As part of the CAP1616A review, would expect this to feature. IE intends to invite the Chair of the Panel to attend a future meeting of ANEG.

AOB

- IE asked if there were any strong preferences around the date of the next ANEG meeting, the options being either just before the summer, the 2nd or 3rd week of July, or the beginning/middle of September.
- Martin Peachey (MP) suggested the next meeting be timed for after publication of the Aviation Strategy. IE responded that we are never certain of publication dates, which require securing of a grid slot, and so asked the group not to assume a date for the next ANEG means that the publication of the Strategy document is confirmed.

The meeting closed at 12:15pm