

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Airport Capacity Programme Board (ACPB)

15 June 2017

Attendees

Caroline Low (CL) – Chair	Rupesh Mehta (RM)	Martin Capstick (MC)
David Browitt (DB)	Sacha Hatteea (SH)	Philip Andrew (PA)
[REDACTED]	Brett Welch (BW)	Rosalind Smith-Reid (RSR)
Rosemary Hopkins (RH)	Tony Poulter (TP)	[REDACTED]
Sarah Bishop (SB)	Farha Sheikh (FS)	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] for Tim Stamp	[REDACTED] - item 3	[REDACTED] – item 6
[REDACTED] – item 4	Sir Jeremy Sullivan (JS) – item 2	[REDACTED]
Apologies: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Dan Micklethwaite, [REDACTED], Lucy Chadwick, Stuart White		

Note

1. Minutes & Actions 16 May 2017 meeting

1.1. Caroline welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1.2. The board agreed the minutes and actions of the previous meeting on 16 May 2017.

2. Independent Consultation Advisor – Final Report

2.1. Sir Jeremy Sullivan (JS) discussed his report. He commented that the consultations went well and that his main area of concern was the leaflet. In light of this being a new role and the first time the government had used such an independent scrutineer, JS asked how valuable his report was to the board. Martin Capstick (MC) assured him that it was and highlighted how helpful the report was.

2.2. The board asked JS what DfT could have done to make his job easier. JS said he would have liked more time to immerse himself in the process. There was a short lead in time from the announcement to the start of the consultations.

[REDACTED]

2.3. JS discussed people's perceptions of the consultation events. Many were disappointed there was not more opportunity for debate (they may have based their expectations on different types of consultations where debate was possible).

2.4. JS raised the issue of the Parliamentary event which was cancelled, and asked whether this would be revived later on. Sacha Hatteea (SH) said there was a discussion to be had about whether there was a need for future consultation events and the revival of the Parliamentary event would be discussed alongside this.

2.5. Caroline Low (CL) thanked JS for his advice and acknowledged that decisions needed to be made about what would happen to JS's report. She said she would contact JS when the Secretary of State has made a decision. JS thanked the DfT Secretariat for their support.

Action 170615/1: Caroline Low to discuss with SoS and JS what will happen to JS's Final Report.

2.6. The benefits of JS's report – especially for those who do not have an in-depth understanding of the consultation process – were discussed. Attention was drawn to paragraphs 42 and 43 of the report.

3. GE Implications and NPS Timescales

3.1. [REDACTED] informed the board that the programme's re-planning work before the election had been borne out. The Select Committee schedule has been pushed back by around 4 or 5 months.

3.2. [REDACTED] said that they hoped the NPS is high on the Select Committee's agenda.

3.3. CL confirmed that the government is maintaining momentum and moving forward with its plans in the wake of the general election.

4. Governance and Assurance of Consultation Analysis – Second Stage

4.1. [REDACTED] presented a paper on this process in April, focussing on what conclusions could be drawn from the consultations. [REDACTED] explained that her current paper on the second stage of the process focussed on creating a 'business-as-usual' process for consultation analysis.

4.2. [REDACTED] explained that the timing of different phases in the plan would depend on factors like the timing of further consultation and the setting up of any future Airports sub-Committee. CL said there was a discussion to be had about what the sub-committee could do in the short term.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

4.3. Discussion moved on to the topic of further consultation. SH said he envisaged a write round taking place before any further consultation was launched. Rupesh Mehta (RM) added that DfT needed to check the original commitments made to Cabinet Office in terms of write rounds.

4.4. [REDACTED] informed the board she would update them on developments.

Action 170615/2: [REDACTED] to present a paper at a future ACPB on the shape, scope and delivery of the further consultation.

5. Programme Update and Risk Register

5.1. [REDACTED] gave a programme update using the ACPB Dashboard. She provided a summary of progress, key programme issues escalated to ACPB, key changes this period as well as an update on resources. She explained that timelines for NPS designation had been re-baselined. There will be a planning workshop with Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) on 29th June 2017 where a date to scrutinise HAL's plans will be agreed. A Project Assessment Review (PAR) review has been confirmed for the week commencing 10th July.

5.2. The board discussed risks to the programme as outlined in the papers.

6. CAA Section 16 Quarterly Report

6.1. [REDACTED] provided an overview on the CAA's latest Section 16 report. She told the board that there were clear expectations on HAL in terms of what they needed to do to move forward.

6.2. [REDACTED] informed the board that some airlines were concerned that the HAL DCO consultation 1 currently planned for September 2017 might tie them down. HAL is considering holding this consultation later in the year instead.

6.3. IAG have questioned the deliverability and affordability of the HAL Northwest Runway scheme. It focussed on the M25 crossing and has spoken publically about its concerns. Engagement between HAL and IAG on these points continues.

6.4. Rosemary Hopkins (RH) asked whether we should be looking to CAA to facilitate engagement more. [REDACTED] commented that CAA has stepped up its scrutiny of HAL with fortnightly reporting. She added that CAA has been encouraged to make recommendations to HAL on an ongoing basis.

6.5. RM commented that the M25 is a common point of criticism (particularly around costs) and further work is taking place in this area, including with Highways

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

England. CL agreed and added that getting a comprehensive grasp of the M25 risk will help the debate.

7. Surface Access Update

- 7.1. [REDACTED] updated the board on the work the Surface Access team had been doing on the paper for BICC (covering surface access in the round) and with rail colleagues on Project HEXAGON. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

- 7.2. The board discussed HAL's targets for delivering modal shift. It noted that there were potentially a number of ways for HAL to meet its targets but that the draft NPS placed the onus on HAL to come up with plans. RM noted that there was a need to explore further the level of HAL's financial contribution to the rail schemes as part of their business cases.

- 7.3. In respect of Project HEXAGON, the Board noted that it was developed on a 'no regrets' basis that could apply in both a 2 or 3 runway world. However, the proposed increase in Crossrail services would increase transport provision to Heathrow from its main market (ie London).

8. Approach to Demand Scenarios

- 8.1. [REDACTED] gave an overview of her paper and the four different options that had been identified. As set out in the paper, she suggested that the refined Airports Commission approach was the best option.

- 8.2. A question was raised about how this analysis would be communicated ie whether it is associated with the Airports Commission. [REDACTED] responded that she would like to maintain the link with the Airports Commission analysis.

- 8.3. [REDACTED] asked whether there was a risk of delay due to parliamentary processes. RM responded that there was still work to do to identify policy and analytical factors that might change plans such as night flights and lifting ATM caps. CL added that it would be possible to carry out sensitivity tests on Heathrow's ATM cap if it is decided at a later date that this is desirable. The board discussed whether they agreed with [REDACTED] recommendation. They felt they were happy for the team to proceed subject to any issues raised by Tony Poulter and [REDACTED] being dealt with when they look at the recommendations in further detail.

- 8.4. TP asked whether there are sufficient assurances. [REDACTED] responded that there are internal assurances and mentioned the recent TASM review of assurance

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

processes. She acknowledged that this type of work could be prone to error and that assurance is an important consideration.

Action 170615/3: [REDACTED] to consider further assurance possibilities.

8.5 The board discussed whether they agreed with [REDACTED] recommendation. They felt they were happy for the team to proceed subject to any issues raised by Tony Poulter and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] being dealt with when they look at the recommendations in further detail.

Action 170615/4: [REDACTED] to arrange a more detailed session with Tony Poulter and [REDACTED] to better understand the options available and consider what the analytical team will come back to the ACPB with.

9. AoB

9.1. The board said goodbye to David Browitt as this was his last meeting and thanked him for the role he has had in the programme.