

- [illegible]

- 2.1.3 A recent HAL/DfT workshop on airspace was well received and it was agreed a further workshop on airspace comms would be useful.

**Action 170911/01- HAL to provide feedback on NPS dependencies paper by 29/09/17.**

**Action 170911/02 – DfT/HAL to schedule workshop on airspace communication proposals**

### **3.0 Update on current events**

- 3.1 An M25 Tunnel Deliverability Study scoping paper produced by Highways England was provided for info by HAL as a precursor to a more substantial discussion on this issue at the next PCB.
- 3.2 [REDACTED] provided an update to the Board on Section 16. Overall engagement with the airline industry is going well and he noted the following key points:
- 3.2.1 HAL's latest update report was provided to the CAA on 8<sup>th</sup> September. There will also be a dashboard detailing how HAL will keep landing charges as close as possible to today's post expansion. Feedback from airlines on this has been generally positive.
- 3.3 CL/EG conversation feedback
- 3.3.1 This was discussed earlier in the meeting- HAL to provide an update by 29<sup>th</sup> September as per the minutes.
- 3.4 Further NPS consultation
- 3.4.1 DfT issued a WMS last Thursday outlining the consultation process, along with Sir Jeremy Sullivan's review of the first NPS consultation.
- 3.4.2 There has been stakeholder interest in the announcement of further consultation, with some interpreting that this could result in a delay to NPS designation. CL made clear that this is not the case and we still expect NPS designation in summer 2018.
- 3.4.3 RM advised that it's important to think of this as a continuation of the existing consultation – to take into account the new passenger demand forecasts and DEFRA's air quality plan - rather than a brand new one.
- 3.4.4 EG voiced concern that there may be unexpected changes to the NPS before the upcoming HAL consultations (airspace and scheme design). CL confirmed that she would not comment on the content of the further consultation beyond what was included in the WMS, to ensure that propriety boundaries are upheld.

### **4.0 Dashboard/Forward Look**

- 4.1 [REDACTED] thanked HAL for producing the draft dashboard which is a useful tool and asked that the weekly HAL/DfT Engagement Sessions keep it populated and up to date.

**Action 170911/03- The December box on the Dashboard will be populated with an Aviation Strategy Update.**

**Action 170911/04- CAA to calibrate Dashboard risks in the same way as HAL to ensure consistency**

**Action 170911/05- HAL/DfT Engagement Sessions to keep the Dashboard populated and up to date, including the comments column.**

## **5.0 Airspace- discussion with [REDACTED]**

5.1 [REDACTED] introduced the paper which provided an update on discussions around introducing the first London Terminal Area (LTMA) Airports Working Group.

[REDACTED] then provided an additional summary with key points as follows:

- 5.1.1 This exists in the wider context of maximising airspace capacity and has received positive responses from airlines due to the common approach.
- 5.1.2 There is an issue around resource - airspace designers, who need to have experience as an air traffic controller, are in high demand.
- 5.1.3 Biggest risk is that some airports will have to put a lot of work into this process for marginal gains, meaning there is a large chance that they may pull out. [REDACTED] voiced a nervousness around the fragility of the program as it was currently dependent on goodwill. [REDACTED] also stated the need to clarify the roles of DfT, CAA and NATS and to have more assurance around this process, and explained work is underway between the 3 organisations as part of the Aviation Strategy.
- 5.1.4 [REDACTED] enquired as to whether there was any future proofing within the process. [REDACTED] confirmed that this was somewhat dependent on the airport but there will be some future proofing as this is very much a process to reach a realistic maximum capacity.
- 5.1.5 [REDACTED] invited [REDACTED] to become an adhoc member of the PCB. [REDACTED] accepted this invitation.
- 5.1.6 [REDACTED] invited questions on the paper (9.6). CL enquired as to the level of seniority of engagement and whether there was anything the DfT could do to assist with the airspace designer shortage issue. [REDACTED] confirmed engagement had been at airport CEO level down and that the resourcing issue is something that they are aware of but there is no real solution at present. CL also commented that this must take into account the impact on communities. [REDACTED] agreed that even marginal airspace changes can be controversial and community engagement will be vital.
- 5.1.7 [REDACTED] invited [REDACTED] to articulate the meeting discussion in closing out the questions posed within the paper and also work with [REDACTED] to provide answers to the four questions posed at the end of the paper.

**Action 170911/06- [REDACTED] to work with [REDACTED] to provide answers to the four questions posed in Paper 9.6.**

## **6.0 Update on 2R airspace changes**

6.1 [REDACTED] introduced the paper which outlines the case for HAL consulting on 2R airspace changes in October 2017.

6.1.1 Consultation must be a minimum of 8 weeks and the plan is to start this on 23<sup>rd</sup> October. Any later and there is a risk that it would close too near to Christmas. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. HAL also made it clear that the consultation had to begin in October so that they were able to use their designated slot for NATs modelling.

6.1.2 [REDACTED] asked for detail around the public narrative to be provided. Airspace changes ahead of the Government's response to the airspace modernisation consultation will be controversial and how they are presented to local communities will be vital. [REDACTED] also raised concern around timings and the presentational risks of both the NPS and airspace consultations taking place at the same time which could result in "consultation fatigue" (the assumption is that both could be launched on October 23). EG agreed that it was not ideal to run two consultations at the same time, but efforts had been made earlier to ensure that HAL and DfT were clear on each other's timelines.

6.1.3 CL advised there were two risks with HAL launching their 2R consultation now: 1) Consultation fatigue and confusion impacting the NPS process; and 2) Interaction with the upcoming Government announcement on airspace guidance, namely there is a risk that HAL might need to re-consult once the guidance has been published.

6.1.4 EG noted these points but was of the view that this is a business decision for HAL. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. If this timeline was not met, EG suggested that there would be a yearlong impact on the timeline to potential delivery of 2R changes.

6.1.5 [REDACTED] suggested that the narrative around IPA needs to be clear for communities and also enquired as to whether HAL will be using new DfT/CAA guidance or not, which will be mandated on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018. [REDACTED] confirmed HAL are following the new (draft) guidance process point by point, despite their approach being named as 'blended'. EG asked [REDACTED] to help ensure the process HAL follows is as up to date as possible. [REDACTED] communicated that there would likely be community backlash should HAL not be fully compliant with the new CAA/DfT policy.

6.1.6 CL expressed concern about the objectives of Con 2R, specifically whether these were resilience related or for a potential early lifting of the ATM cap. EG confirmed that resilience is the primary reason for the 2R consultation (however, that these changes could be used to deliver any early additional movements, which would be subject to their own consultation

process), but agreed a stronger narrative for this would be needed.

6.1.7 ■ suggested that it was important that board members continue to work together to ensure that we have clear public narratives and where possible, we avoid the risk of consultation fatigue or confusion to ensure the public can easily access and absorb information. He also raised the aggregated risk point around consultations, particularly the presentational risk and suggested that a PCB member should consider these risks and articulate how they could be mitigated. ■ asked who from PCB could commission this advice. EG held the view that there will be different views for each organisation, so this will be hard to do. EG also said there was a need for a forward plan which is difficult to agree around the PCB table and that it was now crucial to get the comms narrative moving. CL confirmed the Department need to see this narrative in order to sight the Secretary of State. ■ expressed the view that this is the first piece of major airspace consultation under the new airspace change process and if PCB members are not content with the planned approach then this should be resolved or issues are likely to arise further down the line at other airports. ■ further suggested that all members of PCB should share their thoughts with HAL on key 2R consultation success factors.

6.1.8 Although noting the views of board members, EG confirmed that HAL would likely be going ahead with the 2R airspace change consultation.

**Action 170911/07 - ■ invited members of PCB to note down key success factors for this consultation and provide these to EG.**

**Action: 170911/08 – ■ to be invited to attend PCB on a quarterly basis**

## **7.0 Consultation Comms Strategy**

7.1 ■ took the Board through the paper and the following points were noted:

7.1.1 EG confirmed that HAL planned to brief MPs at party conferences starting next week so need to have feedback from PCB members ASAP on this. CL outlined that the Department still held strong reservations on this approach, and needed further assurance on: i) whether HAL would fully comply with the new airspace change process; and ii) the public narrative for the 2R consultation, to ensure risks of consultation fatigue and confusion were being managed.

**Action 170911/09 - ■ invited PCB members to consider who might provide formal advice on suitable mitigating steps to manage potential risks of public fatigue and confusion around planned consultations.**

**Action 170911/10- JG, ■■■ and ■■■ to discuss the public narrative for the 2R consultation**

**Action 170911/11 - ■■■ and ■■■ to review HAL's proposed consultation process to ensure it is fully compliant with the new process for airspace change.**

## **8.0 Aviation Strategy Update**

- 8.1 ■■■ ran through Aviation Strategy Update slides. ■■■ asked for feedback on last consultation date which is currently scheduled for mid-2018. MG enquired how this will be tracked at PCB as more visibility is required here. ■■■ confirmed she would come back with a policy update in December, but that other DfT boards involving both aviation directorates would provide oversight of this process as it would not be appropriate for PCB to play a role in this.
- 8.2 ■■■ enquired on the choreography of the strategy. ■■■ confirmed that there is a consumer focus to this strategy which is why that paper is coming first, however, there was still work to do on the final timings of the papers given the quantum of the work involved, and welcomed views on the sequencing in response to the call for evidence, which is currently out for consultation.
- 8.3 ■■■ commented that slots could become a contentious issue and this is therefore a risk for the Board to be aware of.

**Action 170911/12- ■■■ to return to PCB in December to provide An Aviation Strategy Policy update.**

## **9.0 AOB**

- 9.1 CL & EB speaking at the same event on Thursday. CL will be recapping WMS and Aviation Directorate will speak on the aviation strategy.
- 9.2 CL asked HAL for clarification on suggestion that Environmental Agency (EA) should be involved in monitoring air quality - helpful to understand what HAL want to achieve with this. EG reflected that this was to ensure an independent voice was involved in auditing HAL's compliance with AQ legal limits, whilst this could be the EA other independent actors could also take on this role.