



Aviation Management Board Meeting

MOD, Eskmeals, Cumbria, LA19 5YR

Date: Thursday, 18 July 2013

Present

MJ	Michael Jampel	DECC – Chair
CG	Chris Gormley	DECC
JH	Jon Hayward	DECC
GG	Gemma Grimes	RUK
SH	Simon Heyes	Infinis (AIFCL Chair)
WC	Wayne Cranstone	RWE (AIFCL deputy)
DBo	David Boyd	Ministry of Defence
PG	Paul Gallagher	Ministry of Defence
KL	Kelly Lightowler	CAA
DJ	David Jones	RWE

Apologies

David Best	DfT
Mark Balsdon	NATS
Matt Clear	CE
Matt Partridge	RUK
Andy Knill	CAA

Introduction, Minutes & Actions

1. MJ opened the meeting noting apologies. The agenda was agreed and CG raised an AOB on behalf of NATS that was taken at the end of business.
2. The draft minutes from the 23 April AMB were approved without amendment. MJ ran through the outstanding actions. It was agreed that action points 4, 21, 24, 26, 28, 31 and 32 had been or would be completed shortly.

Aviation Plan Update 2013/14 and Progress Report

3. JH presented an overview of the dashboard report. The outstanding lighting workstream issue had been resolved and the workstream closed down. WC suggested that a Met Office workstream should be added to the Aviation Plan and dashboard which was agreed subject to future FMB discussions. DJ offered to provide updated information for the dashboard's technical table in his DECC capacity.

4. SH reported the outcome of the FMB's discussions regarding funding for the Eskdalemuir 'Stage 1' research project. The Board was concerned that policy development should ensure that no projects fall out of the planning system while the research progresses. DBo reminded the Board of the purpose of the 'Stage 1' research and confirmed that MOD is unable to consider suspensive conditions at this stage.
5. MJ concluded that, subject to some minor revisions to finalise the text, the Aviation Plan update was agreed. The document would remain unpublished.

MOD Update: Safeguarding

6. DBo advised the Board that MOD, CAA and RUK would be meeting in August to discuss pre-planning tool options. CAAi has made good progress developing its system and it would be good if civil and military data could be aligned. If this was not possible, then it might be possible to offer a lower level report simply advising of potential military objections. CAAi is a commercial organisation and will charge for using the tool. It was thought that charging is not unreasonable and may help focus MOD resource. DBo took an action to include DECC in discussion with CAA and RUK and to report back to the AMB by 30 September for substantive discussion at the 22 October meeting.
7. DBo noted that pre-application validation work was on-going. MOD had written to 1,000 non-RUK members to determine the current status of their projects, of which approximately 300 are still live. MOD will shortly conducting a similar exercise with RUK members. BDo confirmed that MOD is intending to re-introduce the pre-application process in autumn 2013 subject to resource.

Action 33: MOD to provide options for an online pre-planning assessment tool by 30 September.

Infill Radar Guidance

8. DJ introduced the "Guidance on the Use and Integration of In-Fill Radar For Wind Turbine and Wind Farm Mitigation" document (the 'Guidance Document'). DJ explained that one of the pre-conditions the AIFCL placed on funding the C-Speed Whitelee trial was that it had to be conducted against stakeholder requirements to ensure the results were relevant and meaningful. To this end DJ attended the CAA's Aviation Safety Initiative Wind Farm Working Group (ASIWWG) where all of the relevant aviation stakeholders were currently grouped, namely AoA, MoD, CAA, NATS. The ASIWWG explained to DJ that they would be happy to provide requirements on the precondition that these were captured in a Guidance Document that would be made publicly available, so that subsequent mitigation solution providers could conduct their own trials against the same benchmark of requirements.
9. To this end the AIFCL facilitated 2 day workshops in February and May 2012. The results of these workshops were distilled into the Guidance Document which had been subject to 3 rounds of drafting reviews with aviation stakeholders, 1 round with mitigation solution providers and 1 with the AIFCL. DJ noted that there were some outstanding comments to be addressed with

NATS, however he expected this to be completed before the next AMB. Following the inclusion of NATS' comments, DJ welcomed the thoughts of the AMB on taking ownership of the Guidance Document. Ownership would come with the responsibility of reviewing the document annually. If the AMB was minded to accept this, DJ would be prepared to put forward a funding request to the FMB to facilitate the review workshops. DJ suggested that the AMB was the best place for the Guidance Document, given that all of the stakeholders who contributed to it sit on the board, as did the AIFCL who facilitated its creation. MJ suggested, subject to others' views, that the document might be placed on the RUK website.

10. KL supported the view that the AMB might be the best place for the Guidance Document. KL noted that the CAA, as the industry regulator, could not endorse the Guidance Document, as the CAA's regulatory and policy responsibilities were defined across a number of CAP documents including 670 and 764. All AMB members in attendance were in favour of accepting the content of the Guidance Document, recognising that final NATS comments were being incorporated. DBo would check with Sqn Ldr Michelle Betts that the Guidance Document was acceptable, however he noted that he had not heard of any issues from the MOD to date. DJ explained that he had spoken to Sqn Ldr Betts and she had indicated that she was content with it.
11. GG suggested that DECC consider hosting the document on the website recommended in the Government's response to the Onshore Wind Call for Evidence. JH took an action to discuss with DECC colleagues.

Action 34: DECC and RUK to consider website options.

NATS Project RM Update

12. As NATS were not able to attend, CG read a - statement NATS had prepared in advance. NATS had received replies from 11 of the 42 developers with 111 developments that benefited from Project RM as defined in January 2013. The funding currently on offer was insufficient for the project to proceed as it fell short of the £14M required. Based on the data available, and assuming that all developers committed to the extent indicated by their offers, the shortfall could be between £3m and £11m. To reach the £14m target, NATS would continue to concentrate on engaging with and assisting those developers with substantial offers (£2m plus). NATS believed that a lack of risk tolerance within the industry due to funding arrangements and planning consent issues could be limiting take-up.
13. NATS continued to engage with 3 parties, consented developers, unconsented developers and third party funding. NATS had now also engaged with Raytheon and were working towards contracts subject to funding coming forward.
14. The Board noted that, whilst there was some progress on funding, there was some disappointment with the reduced scope and benefit of the project. CG and SH would engage with NATS to discuss options for mitigating those

projects not captured by Project RM. It was suggested that DECC, DfT and the CAA should have a better understanding of the proposed costs and charging mechanism and would take this forward with NATS as funding is agreed.

Action 35: DECC and FMB to engage with NATS on options for mitigating those projects outside the scope of Project RM.

Action 36: DECC, DfT and CAA to discuss Project RM costs and future charging mechanism arrangements with NATS.

Voice Communication Research

15. KL updated the Board on progress that NATS were making with research to investigate the impacts of wind turbines on aircraft voice communications systems (AGA). CAA own this Aviation Plan workstream as they are responsible for any policy or guidance updates that may result from the research. The update was supplemented with information provided by NATS.
16. NATS was funding this £1.8m research programme over two years. It has five aims: to build on earlier work; to develop scientifically credible evidence on detrimental effects; to determine operational impacts; to develop guidance material; and for NATS to develop software tools to assess wind farm applications. QinetiQ and Pipehawk were the main contractors and the work would be undertaken at the Shooters Bottom and Red Tile sites. The research was due to start in August and run until the end of September 2013. The software would be developed by January 2015. The guidance document would need to be timed to fit in with CAA's CAP schedule.

Any Other Business

17. On behalf of NATS, CG informed the Board that NATS were reviewing 15 technologies to inform both itself and its airport customers on current technology development. These assessments and any supported trials would be to enable OEMs to provide full benefits documentation for their solutions and also to enable full evidence of system grooming and integration in busy and existing realistic standard cluttered environment as well as wind turbine cluttered environments. The review was funded by NATS and was for NATS internal use for its airport customers. It would also cover the output of the MOD Technical Demonstration. Attendees had not been aware of this work and asked to be told more about it at the next AMB.

Action 37: NATS to provide more detail on their technology review ahead of the next AMB.

18. MJ stated that the date of the next meeting was scheduled for 22 October at RUK.

END

Annex A

	Owner	Action	Expected Date	Status	Comment
1.	Crown Estate	To complete the mapping project for the next version of the Aviation Plan	17 July 2012	Closed	
2.	DECC	To set up a Working Group to consider regulatory options and update the AMB	15 October 2012	Closed	This action was created to find a claw back mechanism for Raytheon which may no longer be needed under the NATS business model.
3.	RenewableUK	To refresh the Evidence for updates to the Aviation Plan	15 October 2012	Closed	
4.	CAA & DECC	To undertake a stocktake on whether there is a need for new or better guidance for LAs to help assess aviation objections in due course.	15 October	Closed	
5.	DECC	CG to request further updates and propose a new dashboard for future AMBs. A one off workshop for interested parties may be appropriate.	1 September 2012	Closed	
6.	RenewableUK	PA to link to the Raytheon Executive summary in the next RUK newsletter.	15 October 2012	Closed	
7.	NATs	MB to arrange a meeting of interested parties before the next AMB to update on NATS progress.	1 Oct 2012	Closed	
8.	MoD	DBo to produce some lines to explain cessation of pre-application process.	3 August 2012	Closed	Lines now sent to Paul Askew at RUK
9.	DECC & MoD	SR and CG to meet with MoD to consider next steps	30 Sept	Closed	
10.	MoD	DBo and FH to have a paper on ATC ready for the next meeting of the AMB.	1 Oct 2012	Closed	
11.	DECC and Renewable UK	CG and PA to agree on terms and timing of the next meeting of the AAP.	1 Sept 2012	Closed	
12.	AIFCL	TF to contact the Met Office to arrange a meeting with them and DECC.	1 Oct 2012	Closed	
13.	ALL	Workstream owners who had not responded thus far to get in contact with Jon with updates.	12 Nov 2012	Closed	

14.	MOD	DBo to consider what a safeguarding workstream would look like ahead of the next AMB.	22 Jan 2013	Closed	
15.	DECC and MOD	FH and CG to ensure the ATC project is built into the Aviation Plan.	22 Jan 2013	Closed	
16.	CAA and MOD	AK to speak to FH about future spectrum issues for consideration.	22 Jan 2013	Closed	
17.	DECC, MOD & FMB	DECC, MOD and FMB to talk through ATC mitigation demonstration programme proposal.	12 Nov 2012	Closed	
18.	DECC	CG to circulate draft AAP ToRs to AMB members	22 Jan 2013	Closed	
19	DECC	JH to review technology workstream format ahead of next meeting.	23 April 2013	Closed	
20	MOD	PG to consider the commercial confidentiality of the technical readiness status of ATC demonstrator systems	23 April 2013	Closed	
21	RUK, CAA & MOD	PA, KL and DBo to discuss and resolve lighting guidance issue.	23 April 2013	Closed	
22	DECC & MOD	CG and PG to finalise DECC/MOD Memorandum Agreement	23 April 2013	Closed	
23	MOD, DECC & RUK	DB to share pre-application scoping results with CG and PA and discussion future options	23 April 2013	Open	
24	DECC	JH to review progress on action points 4 and 21 with owners	23 July 2013	Closed	
25	DECC & SG	DECC and Scottish Government, in consultation with MOD, to scope and timetable a delivery plan to take forward Eskdalemuir policy options.	23 July 2013	Open	
26	DECC	JH to liaise with AMB Members and workstream owners to revise and agree the Aviation Plan for 2013/14.	23 July 2013	Closed	
27	DECC & RUK	DECC and RUK to liaise to agree the use of Survey data within the Aviation Plan.	23 July 2013	Closed	
28	DECC, FMB and MOD	DECC, FMB and MOD to investigate combining July AMB and FMB meetings with a visit to the demonstration site.	23 July 2013	Closed	
29	MOD, DECC and RUK	MOD, DECC and RUK to consider options for further pre-application work	23 July 2013	Open	

30	MOD, CAA and RUK	MOD, CAA and RUK to discuss options for online pre-planning assessment tool.	23 July 2013	Closed	Work being taken forward under Action 33
31	MOD	MOD to review Irish Sea issue and report back to DECC and CE.	31 May 2013	Closed	
32	DECC	JH to work with members to review date of next meeting.	23 July 2013	Closed	
33	MOD	MOD to provide options for an online pre-planning assessment tool by 30 September.	30 Sept 2013	Open	
34	DECC	DECC and RUK to consider website options.	22 Oct 2013	Open	
35	DECC/FMB	DECC and FMB to engage with NATS on options for mitigating those projects outside the scope of Project RM.	22 Oct 2013	Open	
36	CAA	DECC, DfT and CAA to discuss Project RM costs and future charging mechanism arrangements with NATS.	22 Oct 2013	Open	
37	NATS	NATS to provide more detail on their technology review ahead of the next AMB.	22 Oct 2013	Open	