

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Airport Capacity Programme Board (ACPB)

15 November 2017

Attendees

Caroline Low	Rupesh Mehta	Sacha Hatteea
Sarah Bishop (dialled in)	[REDACTED]	Farha Sheikh
Jack Goodwin	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] (for Phillip Andrews)
Rosemary Hopkins	[REDACTED] (for Tim Stamp)	[REDACTED]
Brett Welch	Jill Adam	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (for Sarah Bishop)	James Adutt	Tony Poulter
[REDACTED] – item 3	[REDACTED] – item 6	[REDACTED] – item 7
[REDACTED] – item 8	[REDACTED] item 9	[REDACTED] (observing)
[REDACTED] (Secretariat)	[REDACTED] (Secretariat)	

Apologies	[REDACTED] Tim Stamp, Lucy Chadwick, Roger Jones, [REDACTED]
------------------	--

Note

1. Minutes & Actions

- 1.1. Caroline Low (CL) welcomed everyone to the meeting and suggested a brief introduction for the benefit of new board members and observers. CL introduced Jill Adam (JA) as a replacement for Martin Capstick; invited to lend project delivery expertise to the board.
- 1.2. CL invited the board's responses to the minutes from the 18 October meeting, of which the board agreed were thorough and no additions were necessary.
- 1.3. [REDACTED] then pointed the board towards the action tracker, highlighting that a few actions were either planned for later in this meeting, such as updates on Highways England / HAL MoU (Action 17108/2), Project Hexagon (Action 171018/3) and HAL consultation 1 (Action 171018/5). The remaining actions are on track for subsequent presentation at ACPB meetings, including the full Forward Look which is currently under review by the Programme Office.

2. Programme update

- 2.1. [REDACTED] introduced the Programme Dashboard, highlighting the launch of the draft NPS Further Consultation on the 24 October, which will run for 8 weeks, and the communications update later in the meeting would cover this in more detail.

[REDACTED]

2.2. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

2.3. In the Wider Aviation section of the dashboard, [REDACTED] highlighted the publication of the Government's response to the recent Airspace Policy Consultation, alongside the launch of the draft Airports NPS Further Consultation. The Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) is now being created and the appointments process is due to begin. [REDACTED] noted that Programme resourcing levels remained the same, with vacancies in the policy team not actively being recruited as these posts are being backfilled by other members of the team.

2.4. CL invited any questions from the board regarding the Programme Dashboard and Risk Register. [REDACTED] queried whether the format of the risk register was going to be reviewed, as previously suggested. [REDACTED] noted that the DfT Governance Division is continuing to review the Department's risk management process but that proposed changes have been delayed. [REDACTED] informed the board that the Programme Office is making local improvements to the management of risk and will provide a fuller risk update at a future board meeting.

2.5. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

2.6. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

3. Communications update

- 3.1. [REDACTED] advised the board that the papers attached were a summary of the dashboard sent to the Secretary of State, regarding the publications on the 24 October. This contained an evaluation of reactions to the announcement and how effective the communications approach had been in reaching target audiences.
- 3.2. [REDACTED] noted that the comms materials had been shared with local authorities and other key stakeholders as part of a 'toolkit' to coordinate communications. This 'toolkit' included tweets for example, to be shared on the day of the announcement.
- 3.3. [REDACTED] reported that reactions in the media had largely been as expected. The Times produced an article that reported the benefits of expansion at Gatwick.
- 3.4. To continue awareness of the further consultation, [REDACTED] reported that paid advertisement would continue until just before Christmas.
- 3.5. JAd highlighted the need to ensure that the Communications Update properly reflected the legal context. CL agreed the need for Communications and Legal teams to work together to ensure accuracy, adherence to propriety protocols and ensure that Press Office colleagues have the latest information regarding propriety and the NPS process.

Action 171115/2 Communications Team to seek legal clearance on future updates to ACPB and ensure Press Office has latest propriety guidance.

- 3.6. [REDACTED] thanked [REDACTED] for a comprehensive dashboard and asked whether it was possible to include this format for future board meetings as a standing item.

Action 171115/3 Communications Team to present their dashboard as a standing item at future ACPB meetings.

- 3.7. [REDACTED] asked about Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) response to the publications. [REDACTED] answered that GAL continued to make the case for expansion at Gatwick, either as an alternative or as an addition to a new Northwest Runway at Heathrow Airport. The CEO of GAL spoke at a conference recently, highlighting the need for a second runway at Gatwick Airport.
- 3.8. [REDACTED] noted that he expected to return to the Board in January with an update on the Comms programme to support a positive vote on any final NPS.

4. Roads update

- 4.1. [REDACTED] presented a road update for the Board's information, on Philip Andrew's behalf. The report summarised the finalised Highways England procurement of a Deliverability Report to assess the impact of HAL's preferred M25 crossing option. TRL have been commissioned to undertake the report with an initial draft to be expected with HE in late November.
- 4.2. [REDACTED] also highlighted the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between HAL and HE had been agreed at working level, but required sign off from legal representatives and senior governance. The MoU is subject to endorsement by the recently established DfT Heathrow Strategic Roads Board; the next meeting is scheduled for the 16 November.
- 4.3. [REDACTED] noted that there was a discrepancy between the minutes of the last board meeting and the timings for finalising the MoU. [REDACTED] asked when this Board would be reviewing the MoU. [REDACTED] noted that a summary of the contents of the MoU had been provided in the Roads Update paper and that the full MoU is being considered at the Heathrow Strategic Roads Board on 16 November. CL suggested that the governance chain for the MoU should be picked up later in the meeting as part of the Governance Review item and noted the appetite from board members to discuss this.
- 4.4. [REDACTED] questioned what the MoU would cover in terms of funding. [REDACTED] noted that the MoU aligns with the position in the draft NPS whereby it is expected that HAL will fully fund the M25 works. CL noted that the Heathrow Strategic Roads Board will need to examine the detail of the proposal. CL thanked everyone for the questions but proposed moving the MoU off the agenda for the current meeting and gathering feedback from the board at a later date.
- 4.5. Sacha Hatteea (SH) asked whether the Deliverability Report would be looking at a range of M25 options rather than just one as suggested in the paper. RM noted that HAL do have a preferred option but that they will be consulting on a range of options. [REDACTED] noted that the Deliverability Report is commissioned by HAL and DfT involvement in the commission may raise concerns regarding the ownership of this project.

5. Rail update

- 5.1. Farha Sheikh (FS) presented her paper to the board, apologising for a missing annex regarding the Heathrow Rail Access (HRA) Programme aims. These were later sent to board members. The paper consisted of an update on the progress of WRLtH and SRLtH, market engagement, Project Hexagon and Crossrail. FS opened for questions from the board.
- 5.2. CL thanked FS for the update and highlighted the need for the Airport Capacity Communications Team to be kept updated on the market engagement work ahead of any announcements/information put into the public domain (eg. PINS notice). TP agreed with this consideration, explaining that market engagement will be heavily scrutinised. Brett Welch (BW) highlighted the importance of ensuring clarity in the decision-making on whether the proposals for WRLtH and SRLtH are

dependent on a third runway at Heathrow decision or would be being proposed in any event.

- 5.3. CL mentioned recent correspondence on a light rail proposal. RM explained that this had been proposed before. FS requested to be sent correspondence/information regarding this.

Action 171115/4 RM to ensure that FS is provided with a copy of the latest correspondence on the Heathrow light rail proposal.

6. Programme governance review

- 6.1. ██████████ presented his paper on governance, seeking the board's approval of its proposed changes. The Project Assessment Review (PAR) led by the Infrastructure and Project Authority (IPA) in July, and the Major Project Review Group (MPRG) Panel made recommendations that the programme should continue to review its governance; particularly in respect to rail access, management of M25 disruption and airspace modernisation.
- 6.2. ██████ highlighted the main changes proposed including; ensuring oversight of key decisions/considerations by ACPB prior to BICC, increasing cross-departmental working regarding the M25, the creation of a new Heathrow Strategic Roads Board and use of the Project Hexagon Steering Group to provide oversight on the proposed Heathrow rail schemes.
- 6.3. ██████ explained that, subject to agreement with ACPB, the next steps include updating the programme's Governance Framework document by the end of November. ██████ noted that the Programme Office is also engaging with DfT Governance Division on the proposed changes and relationship with corporate governance bodies. ██████ added that the changes to the governance arrangements will be included in the response to MPRG in February 2018.
- 6.4. CL thanked ██████ for the work regarding the governance review and asked if the board could be taken through an example of how the governance arrangements would work for a specific decision. For the HAL/HE MoU, ██████ suggested that this would come to ACPB for endorsement before being approved by the Heathrow Strategic Roads Board. ██████ added that a pragmatic approach may be required to ensure timely progress and decision making, with some items being considered via correspondence.
- 6.5. CL commented that she was keen for there to be clarity on the governance for the HE/HE MoU, noting that ACPB is not the decision maker on the M25.

Action 171115/5 HAL/HE MoU to be circulated to Board members following discussion at Heathrow Strategic Roads Board on 16 November.

- 6.6. JA added from a project delivery perspective that governance structures were often complicated, but that the important thing is how you work the arrangements in practice. JA suggested that policy / workstream leads need to provide sufficient

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

assurance that they have planned out the governance arrangements for their specific pieces of work.

6.7. TP noted that the structure is complex but this reflects the nature of the programme. TP also added that there may be some circumstances where there may need to be senior level discussions outside of formal board meetings.

6.8. JG noted that at this stage in the programme we are making tweaks to our governance arrangements and that more detailed work is underway to develop and agree governance arrangements for post any NPS designation.

6.9. CL questioned whether the Forward Look document would help address some of the issues and clarify where decisions are to be made. [REDACTED] agreed that this could help and would be key reference document for the board. [REDACTED] also noted that the governance diagram should make clear who the external party is on each board (eg. does external party refer to HAL or Network Rail for example).

6.10. [REDACTED] asked the programme team to check the agreement made at a previous board meeting regarding CSG's role in overseeing the development of the Relationship Framework Document.

Action 171115/6: [REDACTED] to check CSG's delegated authority regarding the RFD and reflect in the updated Governance Framework.

6.11. RM noted that the rail market engagement work will be overseen by the Project Hexagon Group and that its Terms of Reference should be updated if required.

6.12. TP asked what the MPRG letter had said regarding governance. [REDACTED] noted that the letter broadly aligned with the PAR recommendations. CL added that some MPRG panel members had reflected that the DfT are more siloed than other Government Departments, in particular around the different transport modes.

7. Aviation strategy update

7.1. [REDACTED] presented his paper to the board providing an update for the board's information. He highlighted that several objectives of the ACP are dependent on the review of policies under the new Aviation Strategy, which closed its Call for Evidence on 13 October. The Aviation Strategy Team are currently reviewing responses and updating their plan, which will include a revised consultation timeline (subject to agreement with Ministers). [REDACTED] highlighted that he is working with SB and [REDACTED] on slot allocation and domestic connectivity policy for the preferred expansion of Heathrow Airport.

7.2. [REDACTED] asked how the Aviation Strategy work was being mindful of Brexit implications. [REDACTED] also queried whether the Department had a position regarding competition at airports. [REDACTED] noted that Brexit implications were being considered through the Aviation Strategy work. Regarding competition, [REDACTED] stated that the Secretary of State's views were being sought on this matter.

- 7.3. ■■■ questioned whether there was an issue between aviation strategy consultation and proposed HAL's Con 1 one launching at the same time. SB stated that this would not be too much of an issue as the issues that would be consulted were different.

Action 171115/7 ■■■ to present at ACPB in December with an update on governance arrangements for Aviation Strategy / ACP interface.

- 7.4. BW asked how long haul / short haul connectivity was reflected in the draft programme objectives and asked for the team to take him through the latest version of the programme objectives document.

Action 171115/8 Programme Office to take BW through draft programme objectives.

- 7.5. ■■■ ended his update by asking for any other feedback regarding the timing of the aviation strategy consultations. CL noted that the Aviation Strategy consultations should not be held up but that the teams needed to remain mindful of legal and handling concerns.

8. Update on HAL Con 1

- 8.1. ■■■ outlined an update on HAL's Consultation One (Con 1), currently expected to launch in January. ■■■ stated that Con 1 was the next major milestone relating to HAL's expansion proposal and that this is a pre-Development Consent Application (DCA) non-statutory consultation.
- 8.2. JG added that this pre-DCA consultation aligns with best practice guidance. TP questioned the impact that any potential delay to Con 1 might have. JG noted that the Commercial Team is engaging closely with HAL in order to understand their rationale behind the scope and scale of the consultation and the implications of consulting at this time.
- 8.3. ■■■ asked how much of HAL's consultation material we would expect to see. CL confirmed that DfT will be provided with both the consultation booklet and leaflets via the PCB. CL said the programme team would consider what material it may be helpful for this board to see for information purposes only.
- 8.4. ■■■ asked whether DfT would have access to the responses to HAL's consultation. CL noted that this has come up in discussions and it is a possibility that HAL will publicly release a summary of consultation responses.
- 8.5. ■■■ asked about HAL's 2R consultation and what information this would include relating to the early lifting of the ATM cap. JG noted that HAL is developing thinking behind the 2R consultation. He also noted that there is expected to be some information on a potential early cap lift in HAL's Con 1.

Action 171115/9 Commercial Team to provide a further update on HAL's Con 1 at the next board meeting and consider what consultation material to circulate for information.

Government response to consultation

- 8.6. [REDACTED] presented her paper to the board as a proposed structure to the Government response to both the February consultation and further consultation. [REDACTED] mentioned that this was a skeleton and draws on the approach taken for previous Government responses on other projects.
- 8.7. [REDACTED] asked for feedback on the proposed structure and approach to preparing the Government response.
- 8.8. CL asked for clarity on the purpose of the document and what the team wanted the document to achieve. [REDACTED] explained that it was an opportunity to set out a high level summary of the responses and the Government's conclusions following both consultations. [REDACTED] stated it was an opportunity for both criticisms and affirmations of the programme to be highlighted.
- 8.9. JAd noted that the Government Response could begin to be prepared now, particularly the sections setting out the responses received and other relevant information, but the work clearly could not be finalised until the further consultation responses have been reviewed and decisions subsequently made. JAd added that this needed to be made clear in the paper.
- 8.10. [REDACTED] questioned whether the team proposed to use quotes and indications of scale (eg, majority, most) in the Government Response. SH noted that the team has undertaken detailed work to consider the approach to this as set out in the report produced by OPM which summaries the February consultation responses.
- 8.11. [REDACTED] noted that the working assumption for planning purposes is that the Government's preference decision will remain the same, but recognising that ultimately any final Airports NPS will be informed by the responses received during the consultation. So it was recognised, and accepted, that plans and drafting may need to be amended in due course, with the fact of the associated risk of nugatory work being carried out at this stage. SH noted that the materiality of any changes as a result of the consultation on the draft NPS would need to be considered at the time.
- 8.12. JAd queried the timing of the publication of the Government Response. SH noted that the expectation is that the Government Response would be published at the same time as the TSC response.
- 8.13. RM suggested that it may be helpful for the team to look at the 2010 Heathrow Government Response. JG added that the paper was welcomed and it was good to see early planning of what will be a key document for the programme.

9. AOB

- 9.1. CL thanked the board and summarised that a number of items had been suggested for the agenda for the meeting on 12 December. [REDACTED] stated that she

[REDACTED]

9.3. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[illegible]