

[REDACTED]

Airport Capacity Programme Board (ACPB)

6th June 2018

Attendees

Board Members		
Caroline Low	[REDACTED] (for Sacha Hatteea)	Rupesh Mehta
[REDACTED]	Roger Jones	Brett Welch
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Tony Poulter (TP)
Sarah Bishop	[REDACTED]	James Adutt
[REDACTED] (for Farha Sheikh)		
Other attendees		
[REDACTED] (item 3)	[REDACTED] (item 4)	[REDACTED] (observing and item 5)
[REDACTED] (item 8)	[REDACTED] (item 6)	[REDACTED] (item 7)
[REDACTED] (Secretariat)	[REDACTED] (Secretariat)	[REDACTED] (Secretariat)

Apologies	Lucy Chadwick, Jack Goodwin, Sacha Hatteea, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Farha Sheikh, Jill Adam, Tim Stamp, Philip Andrews
------------------	--

Note

1. Communications Update

- 1.1. Caroline Low (CL) welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that there would be a change to the agenda, with the communications update first.
- 1.2. [REDACTED] provided a communications update that highlighted the amount of work and effort that had gone into preparing for the Sub-Committee meeting and subsequent laying of the Airports NPS in Parliament on 5 June. CL noted the huge achievement that this represents.
- 1.3. In terms of media coverage the announcement was largely received as expected. [REDACTED] noted that the coverage was balanced across the board. [REDACTED] highlighted that support has been received from trade unions and the majority of airlines, except IAG.
- 1.4. [REDACTED] highlighted the next steps and stated that the vote would likely take place in the week commencing 25 June. [REDACTED] also informed the Board that business groups

[REDACTED]

were organising a reception that both the Secretary of State and Baroness Sugg would attend.

- 1.5. CL asked the Board for their views on the media / stakeholder coverage so far. [REDACTED] did not feel that opposition on the floor of the House had put forward particularly positive points. Tony Poulter (TP) noted that he was in Scotland during the announcement and shared that he thought the national coverage followed a theme of 'the Government has finally made progress'. TP also highlighted that he was aware of coverage on third party proposals.
- 1.6. [REDACTED] asked for an update on the vote analysis, based on action 180509/6. [REDACTED] noted that he would provide an update via email.
- 1.7. [REDACTED] asked whether the SNP were supportive of the NPS. [REDACTED] noted that he understood they were supportive.

2. Minutes & Actions

- 2.1. CL invited the Board's comments on the minutes from the 9 May meeting. [REDACTED] highlighted that there had been an edit to point 4.7 raised by [REDACTED]. James Adutt (JAd) also noted that there was a typo in point 4.10 and that references to 'JA' in the minutes should be clarified to either be James Adutt or Jill Adam.
- 2.2. [REDACTED] sought agreement to remove action 170223/13 from the Programme Action Tracker and transfer this to 'business as usual' work. This action relates to 'as part of considering HAL's overall plans, examine their proposed phasing of capacity and the implications'. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] CL noted that the NPS is clear that expansion is required to enable at least an additional 260,000 ATMs per annum from the airport. The Board agreed that this action should remain on the tracker until it was clear how and when this work would be taken forward.

Action 180606/1: [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to agree ownership of ATMs and phasing and confirm work plan.

- 2.3. [REDACTED] enquired about action 180509/5 regarding comms information including an updated infographic and an update on how MPs might vote in the event the NPS proceeds to a vote. [REDACTED] noted that she would follow this action up with the Comms Team and circulate information to the Board.
- 2.4. [REDACTED] provided a verbal update on the status of action 180509/9 (Consider how proposals by third parties would feed into the planning process).
[REDACTED]

3. Programme update

- 3.1. [REDACTED] provided a programme update and informed the board that all documents associated with the NPS had been published on gov.uk on 5 June following the Sub-Committee meeting. [REDACTED] noted that all of the NPS dependencies had been completed with the exception the HAL/Highways England Heads of Terms on the M25 works which will now be agreed prior to HAL's DCO Consultation 2 in January 2019. This approach was agreed with BICC on 21 May.
- 3.2. [REDACTED] noted that the Relationship Framework Document (RFD) and Blight Contract have been signed by both parties and put into escrow. [REDACTED] noted that a copy of the RFD had been included as a below line paper.
- 3.3. [REDACTED] noted that a Westminster Hall Debate on the TSC report is expected to take place on 7 June.
- 3.4. In terms of future programme assurance, [REDACTED] informed the board that an IPA PAR review has been scheduled for w/c 24 September.
- 3.5. [REDACTED] noted that teams are preparing to defend potential legal challenges and transition to the new team structure in the next phase of the programme.
- 3.6. CL asked Sarah Bishop (SB) for an update on the appointment of the ICCAN Head Commissioner. SB noted that an appointment has not yet been made and that work was continuing to progress this.
- 3.7. [REDACTED] noted that the risk register was not included in the papers due to approval timescales. This will be circulated by correspondence after the meeting. [REDACTED] noted that she did not expect risk scores to change, however some risks and KPI's will be closed or completed as key milestones are achieved.

Action 180606/2: PMO to circulate Risk Register (June) when available.

- 3.8. [REDACTED] confirmed that the governance decisions were on track in line with the Forward Look document, except for the M25 HE / HAL Heads of Terms which is now expected to be completed post any NPS decision. The governance timings for the Heads of Terms are currently being reviewed and will be considered at the Heathrow Strategic Roads Board on 27 June, however a slot has been held at BICC on 8 October in the interim.
- 3.9. Since updating the Forward Look, it has now been confirmed that [REDACTED] will be going to BICC on 24 September.

4. Airspace Policy Update

- 4.1. [REDACTED] provided an update on Airspace Policy and talked the Board through the paper provided. The first topic covered the NATS feasibility report into airspace modernisation in the South East. The report was commissioned last year

[REDACTED]

by the Secretary of State, who requested a feasibility assessment of the potential future airspace demands of 15 airports in the South of England. NATS submitted their report in May and [REDACTED] drew the Board's attention to the key findings as set out in the paper.

4.2. A summary of next steps was provided in relation to the feasibility report. [REDACTED] noted that the Department has asked NATS to do further work on the matter by the end of July, including testing whether all 15 airports need to progress their designs and consult in parallel. [REDACTED] noted that the Department has asked the CAA to undertake a period of assurance on the NATS work. This is expected by mid-August.

4.3. [REDACTED] then discussed project management for airspace modernisation including governance and the timeline. With support from the IPA, the Aviation Policy Team has been working with the CAA and NATS to design a new governance structure, including a strategic level group and a ministerial group. This will establish who is accountable for what and the overall structure is expected to be finalised by July, with the focus then turning to membership and ToR's. [REDACTED] thanked the Airport Capacity PMO team for their support in producing a project schedule for airspace modernisation. The baseline timeline has been developed with CAA and NATS and now further work will be undertaken to include multiple different timeline scenarios to help assess risks. Once these scenarios are developed NATS will take the overall timeline and integrate it with plans from each of the 15 airports.

4.4. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] In terms of internal resourcing, the team are looking at their internal structure and have identified a shortage of project management and communications resource. SB added that securing this resource is one of the team's main priorities this year.

4.5. [REDACTED]

4.6. [REDACTED]

4.7. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

4.8. [REDACTED]

4.9. [REDACTED]

5. Key Findings of Early Assurance Review of HAL's Delivery Plan by Costain

- 5.1. [REDACTED] provided a verbal update on the key findings of the Early Assurance Review of HAL's Delivery Plan by Costain. [REDACTED] noted that there have been some minor changes to the Executive Summary since it was shared with the Board in May, but that the substantive findings about feasibility of delivering an operational runway by 2030 and 2026 remain.
- 5.2. [REDACTED] outlined the key next steps for this workstream. The programme risk register is being reviewed to make sure that the findings of the report are incorporated and being monitored / actioned. Work will also begin on scoping the assurance of HAL's single masterplan later in the year – an update on this will be presented to the Board in August for their views.
- 5.3. [REDACTED] questioned whether HAL will be ready to select a single masterplan by the end of September, noting that there may be more challenge than anticipated. CL acknowledged that the timetable is tight and that this is being monitored through the Programme Coordination Board and regular engagement with HAL at working level. [REDACTED] asked whether assurance would be undertaken of any plans put forward by Arora Group.

Action 180606/3: PMO to confirm assurance plans re. any third party proposals.

Post Meeting Note: Arcadis are undertaking assurance of third party proposals.

6. Rail update

- 6.1. [REDACTED] provided the board with a rail update and highlighted the market engagement industry day held on 24 May which went well and formally marks the start of the market sounding exercise on Southern Rail Access to Heathrow (SRAtH). [REDACTED] noted that the Secretary of State had made it clear at the industry day that he expects SRAtH to be funded by the private sector.
- 6.2. [REDACTED] then discussed the current progress that is being made on Western Rail Access to Heathrow (WRAtH). The statutory DCO consultation is live and is due

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

to close on 22 June. The OBC is currently under development, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

6.3. [REDACTED] noted that Stuart White would be taking over from Farha Sheikh as the Deputy Director for Heathrow Rail Access in Rail Network Services from July. [REDACTED] added that Stuart has been invited to future Board Meetings.

6.4. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

6.5. [REDACTED] CL noted that this was not on her current issues list and suggested that this could be covered in a future Rail Update to the Board.

[REDACTED]

7. Heathrow Rail Access – Governance Update

7.1. [REDACTED] provided a brief update on governance for the Heathrow Rail Access programme.

7.2. A number of future milestones were highlighted. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

7.3. [REDACTED] provided a brief outline of the current timeline for WRAtH. It is anticipated that the DCO application will be submitted at the end of June 2019, which will also be accompanied by a funding statement. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

7.4. [REDACTED] enquired as to who was responsible for implementing HEXAGON contract management. [REDACTED] replied stating that the HEXAGON Steering Group, chaired by Peter Wilkinson, will continue. This will facilitate strategic conversations between all parties. Discussions are still ongoing with the One Railway team regarding secretariat and monitoring responsibilities for HEXAGON.

7.5. [REDACTED] enquired about the 'Red Teaming' activity and what the makeup of this team would look like. [REDACTED] stated that the team will be sufficiently knowledgeable but suitably distant from the project to provide an independent view and assurance.

[REDACTED]

7.6. TP stated that he had seen a figure quoted for the cost of WRAtH. [REDACTED] replied that the figure quoted only concerned the expected cost of the tunnel, [REDACTED].

8. Roads Update

8.1. A roads update was provided by [REDACTED] and the Board's attention was drawn to point 6 regarding the HE/HAL Heads of Terms (HoT). [REDACTED] noted that the timing of this work is being planned in detail and that expectations with HAL are being confirmed.

Action 180606/5: Timings for agreement of the HAL/HE HoT regarding M25 works to be confirmed by Roads Team and agreed with Heathrow Strategic Roads Board.

8.2. [REDACTED] requested further information on why the anticipated date for agreement of the HoT had moved from August to October 2018. [REDACTED] confirmed that this was due to slot availability at BICC meetings. TP suggested that it may be worth chasing up this issue as it may be possible to get an earlier slot.

Action 180606/6: Liaise with BICC Secretariat to consider whether an earlier slot can be accommodated to consider the HAL/HE HoT, should this be required.

8.3. [REDACTED]

8.4. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

9. ACPB Role – Board Discussion

9.1. The subject of the future of the ACPB post any NPS designation was raised by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] described how the role of the programme will be changing from one of policy development towards one that focuses on managing interdependencies, working more closely with HAL and other stakeholders as appropriate and

[REDACTED]

defending potential legal challenges. As such ACPB will need to evolve to ensure that it is fit for purpose in the next phase of the programme.

- 9.2. [REDACTED] noted that this topic will be looked at in greater detail in the September ACPB meeting and will consider what decisions and issues the board needs to focus on in the next year. In advance of this, the board was invited to provide their initial thoughts on the role of the Board to inform this session.
- 9.3. TP suggested that it may be beneficial for the PMO and programme teams to think about whether they get what they need from the Board. CL noted that as part of the MPRG panel and IPA review she had been asked if the Board was helpful to her as SRO and whether it provided the right balance of support and challenge.
- 9.4. [REDACTED] enquired as to whether ACP was looking at other governance forums and how they contribute whilst completing this exercise. [REDACTED] responded that the intention is to consider how the Board relates to other governance forums (eg BICC, Rail and Roads) as well as the coordination forums in place with Heathrow and the CAA (ie. PCB and its sub-boards). TP added that clarifying the link between ACPB and PCB would be helpful.
- 9.5. [REDACTED] stated that he is supportive of reviewing governance arrangements and questioned the role that the programme wanted the Board to play. [REDACTED] noted that it would be helpful to discuss whether the Board should be a decision making forum or used to seek steer and challenge. RJ noted that the role of the Board may change over the next year with a period of defending legal challenges and then moving on to longer term delivery. RJ queried whether there is a temporary role during any legal challenges for the board and then a more long term role.
- 9.6. CL responded stating that she feels that the discipline of having the Board and gathering its views and strategic steer was invaluable. With regard to the links with PCB (which includes HAL and the CAA), CL highlighted that there are always going to be issues where the Department will need to take its own view.
- 9.7. PB highlighted the benefit of ACPB in drawing together the various cross cutting areas. [REDACTED] noted the unique make-up of the Board and how there was value in drawing together the different modes across the Department relevant to expansion at Heathrow.
- 9.8. [REDACTED] sought clarity on propriety arrangements in the event that the NPS is designated. CL noted that an entirely separate team within the Department will be established to lead on consideration of HAL's DCO. [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]