

Aviation Management Board Meeting

RUK, Greencoat House, Francis Street, London SW1P 1DH

Date: Tuesday 17th July 2012

Present

SR	Sarah Rhodes	DECC – Chair
OK	Olivia Knibbs	DECC
CG	Chris Gormley	DECC
DBe	David Best	DfT
MC	Matthew Clear	The Crown Estate
NH	Neal Henley	CAA
MB	Mark Balsdon	NATS
MP	Matt Partridge	RUK
PA	Paul Askew	RUK
SH	Simon Heyes	Infinis (AIFCL Chair)
TF	Tim French	RES (AIFCL deputy)
SCo	Simon Coote [by phone]	Scottish Government
DBo	David Boyd	Ministry of Defence
FH	Fabrizio Harley	Ministry of Defence

Apologies

RS	Rob Siddall	AOA
AK	Andy Knill	CAA

Introduction

1. SR opened the meeting accepting apologies from AOA. A round table introduction presented DBe in place of John Parkinson for DfT, NH in place of Andrew Knill for the CAA and TF attended on behalf of the AIFCL in place of Wayne Cranstone. SCo joined by teleconference and MP introduced himself as Bill Richmond's successor as the new RUK Board member.
2. New members of the DECC team, OK and CG, were introduced by SR and the Board were informed that ORED will have a slightly new structure in the next couple of weeks. SR also took the opportunity to inform the Board that David Jones will be joining DECC on a part time basis. He will split his time with his current post at RWE. Strict rules on conflicts of interest have been agreed and must be adhered to and the work he undertakes will be managed to avoid impropriety.

3. The draft minutes from the 17 April AMB were approved and there were four outstanding actions from the previous meeting, one of which is complete, one on hold and two remain open [see annex to the Minutes for action table].

Aviation Plan

4. CG set out the new format of the Aviation Plan which contained all the material agreed by the Board at the last meeting, but condensed and focussed much of the material hopefully making it more practical. DECC would own the plan and ahead of future meetings seek more active engagement on progress against milestones, consider new milestones and risk assessment to each work stream.
5. MC welcomed the new approach and suggested a dashboard be presented to each AMB with key projects, risks and work stream updates. It will be important to quantify our project and risk ratings and MC offered the opportunity to potentially meet up or take part in a workshop to discuss how this might be achieved.
6. There was also a general feeling that the Aviation Plan should look ahead 15 - 20 years where possible to become a more strategic document and recognise some of the wider influences.

Action 1: CG to request further updates and propose a new dashboard for future AMBs. A one off workshop for interested parties may be appropriate.

Raytheon – NATS update

7. MB gave an update on Raytheon. The executive summary had now been published on the DECC website and subsequently linked to the NATS website. Some of the developers MB had spoken to were still not aware of its publication and PA committed to include the link to the DECC website in the next RUK newsletter to stakeholders.
8. Following the request from the AMB for MB to build a business case for the Raytheon upgrade, he had now assessed that +100 developments need mitigation with 400MW – 6.5GW of capacity potentially releasable by Raytheon depending on how the solution is deployed alongside other mitigation solutions. MB stated that he had to date been in contact with 30 or so developers and other interested parties. MB is currently looking at what a SPV might look like and how much NATS might be able to invest themselves before finalising any proposal. Although he has discussed internally with Operational and Services MDs, there are currently several different models being considered internally and would therefore hope to have greater internal clarity by the end of September.
9. MP was keen to understand the model for cost recovery and MB confirmed it could be on a £/MW basis, however it was not possible to give an indication at this stage what that price will be as NATS work to understand what can be moved across in terms of mitigation. TF wondered how the pipeline capacity

had been factored into the business case. MB reassured that of the 50+ current developments he knew of, a percentage estimate had been taken and then a smaller percentage for pipeline project mitigation.

10. There was a question as to whether this model would need to be taken forward through the regulated or commercial arm of NATS. MB thought that it was possible for it to be done through either side but the regulated base would mean a potential delay of 12 – 18 months and may make the scrutiny process in NATS more difficult to satisfy. DBe backed this up that the regulated part would add an extra layer of complexity and although not a showstopper, it would be far easier to move things forward on the non-regulated side. SH wondered if there would be any issues with providing a non-regulated upgrade to a regulated asset. MB believed that it was possible to work a solution and people within NATS have experience of dealing with this issue.
11. TF asked a final question on whether this needed to be cleared through the MoD. MB said that certain aspects would need to be and he has raised it with the MoD en-route team. Given NATS will have more clarity by the end of September, SR asked MB if he would organise a separate session outside of and before the next AMB to present NATS' proposals. MB agreed to set this up on his return from leave.

Action 2: PA to link to the Raytheon Executive summary in the next RUK newsletter.

Action 3: MB to arrange a meeting of interested parties before the next AMB to update on NATS progress.

MOD Update

12. SR asked MoD for an update on the current state of applications and also on the business case which had been specifically funded by DECC and indirectly via the AIFCL's funding of the post. DBo started by announcing that MoD has ceased to provide a pre-planning application advice service, however MOD aims to resume this service as soon as practicable. This was due to both resource issues within the team and also the unprecedented numbers of applications – currently at around 400 pcm. DBo had been in contact with RUK and agreed that this needed to be communicated to the industry and will produce some lines for PA within the next 2 weeks. More generally, PA raised the issue of Pre-planning and what options were there to ensure that those people unwilling to progress without pre-planning don't fall out of the system. SH backed up this point but DBo clarified that the cessation of pre-planning was only likely to be a short-term measure.
13. DBo then updated the Board on Radar upgrade work. MOD has added an additional signatory to the existing signatories for the TPS-77 air defence radar at Brizlee Wood. It was envisaged that the completion of this process will smooth the path for subsequent signatories. Discussions have also begun on a mitigation to address MOD concerns at Buchan and we will be kept updated on that proposal. On Precision Approach Radar (PAR) DBo believed that this was

not the priority area as currently the numbers were small and the mitigation is potentially difficult to achieve. SH confirmed that this was consistent with industry's understanding.

14. On Military Air Traffic Control (ATC) it was accepted that progress had been slow. FH updated the group to say that he had prepared project documents as part of a project management plan and started the generic solution business case but given there are no proven technologies out there that had reached MoD's Technology Readiness Level 7, it was not possible to complete it. He believed that his next task was to try and de-scope the project to prove that technology is available that can meet MoD's ATC capability needs while delivering windfarm mitigation. MB and TF asked if the recent air service workshops had been fed into the business case but DBo and FH reinforced that until a technology is proven to the MoD's satisfaction, MoD cannot consider it – what was needed was a technology demonstration. SH underlined that Developers, through the AIFCL, had taken risk in investing in technologies which could demonstrate potential mitigation but what was actually missing was a clear set of requirements from MoD. At this stage it was unlikely that any technology would come forward without a clear message from the MoD on what is required and expected.
15. SR wondered if there was anything members of the AMB could do to help MoD in preparing the business case and SH pointed out that in the past there had been offers of secondees but there had been no take up of this offer to date. DBo committed to MoD producing a paper for the next Board which builds on the project Plan FH had been working on. SR agreed that DECC and MoD will meet in the coming weeks to talk about next steps.

Action 4: DBo to produce some lines to explain cessation of pre-application process by 3 August for RUK to distribute.

Action 5: SR and CG to meet with MoD to consider next steps.

Action 6: DBo and FH to have a paper ready for the next meeting of the AMB.

Aviation Advisory Panel (AAP)

16. Over recent weeks CG had spoken with various members of the Board about the value of re-introducing the AAP and wanted an open discussion on whether there would be value in re-introducing it and potentially calling one in the coming months. DBe pointed out that it was last agreed that it could be called as and when it was needed but the last meeting had been in November 2011.
17. SH thought that there was value in continuing with the AAP as new technologies came forward and that it should be led by the Aviation Plan Manager. PA said that recently 4-5 new technology solutions had been mentioned to him which suggests it is time for a meeting. MB agreed that quarterly would be too often and an as when approach should be adopted.

Membership should also not be rigid and only the relevant people should attend.

18. TF noted that the Met Office were still a source of objections and a previously tabled mitigation project might be put on the agenda of the AAP. He agreed to follow up with his contacts in the Met office and potentially set up a meeting.

Action 7: CG and PA to agree on terms and timing of the next meeting of the AAP.

Action 8: TF to contact the Met Office to arrange a meeting with them and DECC.

Any Other Business

19. TF wondered when the update on Eskdalemuir was due. DBo informed that the next Working Group was planned for 2 August and a technical proposal would be prepared for that. SCo was keen to know who would take forward Dr Bower's work and DBo assured that there would be options for delivery presented to the Working Group.
20. DBo also updated the group that there was a new Chief Operating Officer in DIO – Mark Hutchinson and he also had a new 1* Brigadier Mark Armstrong.
21. Date of the next meeting will be 15 October 2012 (14:00-16:00) 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	Ongoing	On hold	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 regularly for updates to the Aviation Plan	15 October 2012	Open	
4.	RenewableUK	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	Open	
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	Open	
6.	RenewableUK	PA to link to the Raytheon Executive summary in the next RUK newsletter.	15 October 2012	Open	
7.	NATs	MB to arrange a meeting of interested parties before the next AMB to update on NATS progress.	1 Oct 2012	Open	
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	Open	
10.	MoD	DBo and FH to have a paper on ATC and PAR ready for the next meeting of the AMB.	1 Oct 2012	Open	
11.	DECC and Renewable UK	CG and PA to agree on terms and timing of the next meeting of the AAP.	1 Sept 2012	Open	
12.	AIFCL	TF to contact the Met Office to arrange a meeting with them and DECC.	1 Oct 2012	Open	