



**Note of the Commission meeting**  
**9<sup>th</sup> January 2013**

|                           |                          |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Attendees</b>          |                          |
| Sir Howard Davies         | Chair of the Commission  |
| Vivienne Cox              | Member of the Commission |
| Geoff Muirhead            | Member of the Commission |
| Professor Ricky Burdett   | Member of the Commission |
| Professor Dame Julia King | Member of the Commission |
| Sir John Armitt           | Member of the Commission |
|                           |                          |
| Phil Graham               | Secretariat              |
|                           | Secretariat              |
|                           | Secretariat              |
|                           | Secretariat              |
|                           | Secretariat              |
|                           | Secretariat              |

**1. CAA briefing:**

The Commission received a presentation from the CAA on consumer demand, safety and operability, sustainability and financeability. The key actions that arose were:

- CAA to share their data on the proportion of connecting passengers using Heathrow routes.
- CAA to share the break down of business journey purposes.
- CAA to consider what the range of levers are for making optimal use of existing capacity.
- CAA to provide the Commission with information regarding the key assumptions that should be set out for those making noise assessments as part of their submissions to the Commission.

**2. Commission meeting:**

**Round up of stakeholder meetings attended**

No meetings had taken place since the last meeting but JA had been approached by Daniel Moylan for a meeting.



## Submissions guidance scoping document

It was noted that this paper would be published at the end of January 2013 with the demand paper being published to similar timescales.

The Commission was asked whether the guidance document should set out the assessment criteria for the long term options or whether in fact the purpose of the guidance document was simply to give a steer of what we were looking for to scheme promoters ahead of working with them to define more clearly what the assessment criteria would be. The assessment criteria would have to be different for the short and medium term measures and the long term options.

The main points raised were that the tone of the document needed to sound more like the Commission than a Government document, a clearer approach to the timing of the assessment criteria was needed and that the tone of the introduction should be made more forthright.

It was proposed to have a 'screening criteria' early on which would then be followed by assessment criteria to allow for more focused consideration of those proposals that got through the screen criteria.

Other points raised to consider in the next iteration of the guidance document were:

- That those making submissions should be encouraged to submit 'integrated' proposals.
- The criteria needed to include something on affordability and financing.
- That there should be more focus on benefits to UK plc
- That we needed to be clear that the Commission would be leading the work on identifying the short and medium term measures but that we would be open to proposals.
- That it would be helpful to encourage those submitting short and medium term measures to think about what could be achieved if barriers could be removed to provide more capacity.
- That the deadline for the short and medium term measures and that of the long term proposals should be different.
- That it would be helpful to have input from the CAA on the assessment criteria for airspace and safe delivery

It was suggested that expert handling advice would be helpful for managing the process set out in the guidance document and that lessons would need to be learnt about managing public opinion from projects such as HS2.

Finally, the Commissioners discussed some of the sensitivities in handling climate change policy in their work.



**Action:** The next iteration of the guidance document and demand paper would be sent to the Commission via correspondence.

**3. AOB:**

**Action:** Secretariat to circulate an organogram of the team to the Commission.

**Action:** Name plates to be provided at the next meeting.