



**Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise**  
**12th BOARD MEETING**  
 Wednesday 25 March 2020 at 2.00pm  
**Video Conference**

**Board members present:**

RL - Robert Light, Head Commissioner  
 SK - Simon Kahn, Commissioner  
 SH(c) - Simon Henley, Commissioner  
 HS - Howard Simmons, Commissioner  
 CN - Colin Noble, Commissioner  
 SH - Sam Hartley, Secretary to the Commission

**Other ICCAN staff in attendance:**

SC - Stephen Cooke, Head of Communications and Engagement  
 AG - Andy Ginever, Business and Finance Manager  
 EM - Emma Mead, Chief Analyst  
 SHy - Sheila Honey, Chief Analyst  
 ES - Emma Strahan, Private Secretary and Business Support Officer (Minutes)  
 RBm - Rupert Basham, Engagement Lead (Presenting, item 4 only)

**Apologies: None**

Item No	Agenda Item	Minutes	Actions Agreed
1	<b>Approval of previous minutes and matters arising</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Previous minutes discussed. One correction requested from SK under item 4 'project update'. SK asked for wording to be changed so that it states optional rather than 'minimum'. Minutes formally approved with that correction.</li> <li>- Actions from last minutes to be reviewed at next meeting in light of changed context (ie COVI-19 pandemic)</li> <li>- No matters arising.</li> </ul>	<b>ES</b>

Item No	Agenda Item	Minutes	Actions Agreed
2	<b>COVID-19 strategic and operational impact assessment</b>	<p><b>Strategic impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RL led a full board discussion about the importance of recognising the changes in the landscape for aviation. Particularly the changes in the environment due to lack of aviation at present, as it may change public perception of aviation and flying.</li> <li>- SH (c) raised a question of how do we introduce noise as a factor when we go back to flying again? RL highlighted that we might see a phased return of international travel and a phased return to the levels of travel. Also that face to face meetings across the planet may reduce as a result as people have shifted to using IT systems more frequently.</li> <li>- ICCAN board agreed that we need to think about how we land our messages and how they are worded. It may be an opportunity to 'reset' and we don't have to go back to how it was.</li> <li>- Both the board and feedback from the ICCAN team highlighted that this time period could be used as an opportunity to start collecting some data about what it has looked like whilst the planes haven't been flying. ICCAN could use this time to do some data capture about what the aviation world sounds like now, especially if there are delays in areas of the work programme.</li> <li>- RL noted that ICCAN could work to get itself in front of the potential capacity, expansion and what is the demand conversations that will start to happen when worldwide travel starts again.</li> <li>- SK asked if we should be pressing that aviation restarts with the new and current baseline measurements in mind. ICCAN could ask the airports and the local authorities to take those measurements. Some airports will be collecting the long-term data anyway and so they could show what the baseline background noise is even without the planes flying.</li> <li>- SK also noted that we have to be careful because there is also reduced road, rail and human noise due to the lockdown. SH (c) agreed, adding that when the stay at home message is lifted, the traffic noise will be the first to return, aircraft will come after and so the</li> </ul>	

		<p>noise recordings could show a staging approach. In addition SH (c) asked if we could use this time to press for the quietest aircraft coming back first?</p> <p>- RL agreed that if the older, noisier and less environmentally friendly aircraft are the last ones to return to the skies it would be a great achievement HS noted that it could be a really exciting opportunity to raise the conversation about this as well as gather data about the community reaction to the reduced aircraft noise.</p> <p>- RL asked the board to agree on a clear plan and consensus about what we do and what our work plan looks like now. Board agreed that the strong public message would be yes restart aviation but restart with the quietest aircraft first.</p> <p>- SC highlighted that there is also the issue of new technology and how that will fit in with the new landscape. SC also commented that from a communications perspective ICCAN will need to think about how our story will fit with the airports and airlines narrative about survival and rebuilding.</p> <p>- SK noted that we could get social data as no one else will be during that, we can nudge the airline returning strategy, and ensure that the data recorded now and over the next few weeks is used in a useful way.</p> <p>- SHy highlighted that we might be able to get a question into an attitudinal survey that is currently running to assess some of the current thinking and experiences of community members? SK asked if we could ask NatCen to do something within the sphere of the work that they are already carrying out for us, perhaps a simple survey to get some data.</p> <p>- RL summarised the conversation, noting that there were three suggestions which were apparent; firstly can we add to current survey, secondly can we get the noise data recordings that are currently happening at the larger airports and thirdly can we influence the use of the quieter aircraft first when they restart? Agreed by whole board.</p> <p>- With regards to ICCAN's current work programme, schedule and staffing capacity. RL noted that ICCAN should not be publishing reports into this current climate. We need a high level of support and engagement from across sectors which we can't get at</p>	<p><b>EM and SHy</b></p> <p><b>EM, SHy and SC</b></p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>the moment. RL noted that he felt that we need to push the April publications into June. The toolkit would also be delayed. We might have to make changes to our documents and the toolkit. We might have to change our overall strategic objectives and work programme.</p> <p>- CN agreed that we shouldn't be publishing a normal business report at present so agree that we should pause. If we don't it could potentially affect our credibility. SH (c) noted that the reasons for not publishing are twofold, we cannot consult or peer review at present plus we expect content to change. However, he highlighted that we still need to function and draft reports which then can be reviewed before publishing later in the year.</p> <p>- SK noted that there will be reports which we expect to change in a new environment, such as the toolkit and there will be reports that won't change such as noise metrics. How are we going to communicate why we haven't published and how will it look in three years' time when people are looking back and don't feel the same as they do now. We need to keep timescales tight.</p> <p>- RL agreed and felt that the focus of ICCAN's thinking should be on making sure that we use the next 3-6 months to be ahead of the agenda, rather than being behind the agenda as we have been since the start.</p> <p>- SH noted that it was likely that airspace modernisation will be pushed back for at least a year, and that we would ensure that we engaged with the CAA and ACOG on future planning meetings for the masterplan re airspace modernisation. CAA are dealing with safety, freight and a challenge to its income stream. ICCAN will talk to the CAA as soon as we can about our changed work plan and our ambitions over the next few months.</p> <p><b>Operational impact</b></p> <p>- SH gave a short update on the operational impact of COVID-19 on ICCAN. The Senior Management Team (SMT) have worked hard to ensure that we have oversight of our capacity from the impact of the virus, school closures, isolation etc. SMT's focus has been the health and wellbeing of the staff and we have been doing lots of VC meetings so that staff can develop skills in new technology. Currently ICCAN has six staff</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>who are needing to flex their hours due to childcare and caring responsibilities. ICCAN has a thorough crisis and resilience plan and has reduced social media activity.</p> <p>- SH has decided to continue with recruitment campaigns as resources still need bolstering and work needs to continue. The SMT felt that by continuing with recruitment it reflected that ICCAN was serious about its work continuing.</p> <p>- The comms and engagement plan will have to change over the summer as our work programme changes and publication dates are changed. The team are developing a brief newsletter to go out at the end of this month, ensuring that the right balance is struck with a message that although our work is not essential right now, we see ourselves as front and centre in the conversation going forwards. Board agreed publication of the newsletter.</p> <p>- SK asked that the board's thanks to the team for being flexible and working together at this time are recorded.</p>	
--	--	--	--

3	<b>Project Update: Noise Metrics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EM presented slides showing the key findings, which now have more clarity and the final recommendations for the project. SK queried and clarified one point on the slides: that data is used to validate the ANCON model but not to inform the contour maps.</li> <li>- RL asked how do we address the issue of frequency rather than level of noise, how is that shown? EM noted that is captured in the report itself.</li> <li>- RL noted that community groups have had temporary noise monitoring requests refused by the airports; should we have some criteria about their usage that sits behind our guidelines? Change this recommendation to upon request? HS highlighted that some airports only have a restricted amount of noise monitors so it could be physically impossible to answer eight requests if you only have two monitors</li> <li>- EM acknowledged that the noise metrics report is unlikely to change in the current context, but it will be subject to continual review. The report is still going through internal checking process and we are trying to keep to timelines as much as possible, but it is being affected by reduced staffing capacity.</li> <li>- RL asked if the recommendations cover the concerns that board members have heard when meeting with stakeholders and are the recommendations reasonable? Board agreed that recommendations are reasonable and cover concerns heard but that the report needs to be made more accessible.</li> <li>- SH (c) stated that we need to strike the right balance between having a detailed report and also demystifying it. Do we need to publish something alongside? To make it accessible and to ensure that it is communicated and interpreted in the right way.</li> <li>- The board concluded by extending its thanks to KP and the Chief Analysts for shaping the report into its current form.</li> </ul>	
---	--	---	--

4	<b>Project Update: Consultation Toolkit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC and RBm presented their progress with the toolkit, how their activities had been feeding in and what they were doing with all the information gained.</li> <li>- RBm fed back on the successful recent workshop held in Birmingham with airport representatives, the CAA and ACOG. It highlighted some key areas of the debate.</li> <li>- HS asked was there anything raised about the nature of community representation? Some groups are small but lobby hard and therefore you risk missing the wider community. RB noted that accessing the wider community is part of the toolkit.</li> <li>- SC highlighted that lots of progress has been made and an awful lot of work has gone in. We need to put it out to proper peer review, the CAA and the TCI.</li> <li>- HS asked if there are organisations, outside of the aviation world, who might be able to comment on the approach more broadly? We only focus on noise but the framework of the process we use could be applied elsewhere perhaps?</li> <li>- CN asked about using the consultation institute to help us develop and shape this? Do they effectively give it the stamp of approval? Or have they just inputted advice? RBm stated that they will be referenced in the toolkit but that they won't get full accreditation as the work is ICCAN's; TCI has offered support and guidance and some specific tools.</li> <li>- RL stated that we need to make sure it is not just average – how is it new? How do we prevent people saying 'we knew all that already'? Just putting lots of existing things in one place might not be enough.</li> <li>- CN noted that perhaps we should do an easy read/accessible as they are often great for distilling the argument. RL agreed, noting that what he hears from community groups is a problem with lack of clarity from the airports and this might some way to help that.</li> </ul>	
---	---	--	--

		<p>- The board noted thanks for all the work so far, that they are happy with the general direction and would like draft copies sent to CN, HS and RL.</p>	<p><b>RBm</b></p>
--	--	--	-------------------

5	<b>Project Summary: Highlight Reports</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SHy presented the work programme highlights report. It was noted that all the projects that had previously had a green rating have been moved to amber due to uncertainty around internal resourcing issues and external dependencies caused by Covid-19.</li> <li>- Board agreed that best practice guidance is appropriate for the land planning use project.</li> <li>- With regards to insulation work piece, a question was put to board if the report should be looking at insulation for noise sensitive buildings? SK noted that residential noise insulation schemes are the key issue for our work, there is guidance for other noise sensitive buildings such as schools and hospitals. CN asked how does it fit with building regulations? And noise attenuation? SK stated there is nothing in building regulations about external sound insulation just internal sound insulation, but external sound insulation needs to consider other parts of building regulations including ventilation, conservation of fuel and power.</li> <li>- SHy highlighted that the regulation piece of work is going to be sensitive. RL agreed that this piece of work needs to be appropriate to the changing aviation landscape, and so is likely to be delayed in order to sync in with the Government's Aviation Strategy work. Our intention should still be to publish before the end of the year. There are multiple questions throughout the piece of work that we might not want to answer straight away but may be the focus of some follow up work.</li> <li>- The board agreed that ICCAN can do a lot of the work to develop our understanding and then be in the right position to release when ready. SK noted that in a few weeks it might be apparent that there are some sectors that we can engage with and so that will help to shape our work.</li> <li>- HS wished to note that there is a brilliant level of work occurring across the whole team. SH (c) agreed that the level and quality of work is excellent and over and above what the board had expected.</li> </ul>	
---	---	---	--

**OFFICIAL FOR PUBLICATION**

		- The board formally approved all the recommendations for each project and notes thanks for team for their presentations.	
--	--	---	--

<b>6</b>	<b>Governance Update: Board Forward Look</b>	- Board agreement that the planned Forward Look review be suspended until we have updated the work programme in light of today's decisions. A revised work programme timeline and the corporate strategy refresh document is brought to next board meeting.	<b>SH</b>
----------	--	---	-----------

	<b>Any other business</b>	- None	
		<b>Date of next meeting: 29 April 2020 at 2pm, via video conference</b>	

Signed

**Robert Light**  
**Head Commissioner**

Actions Table

<b>Item Number</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>
1	Amend previous meeting mins with correction	ES
2	Investigate ways to collect data during time of less aviation activity in coming months	EM and SHy
3	Draft of the consultation toolkit to be sent to CN, HS and RL to review	RBm
4	New work programme timeline and corporate strategy refresh to be brought to April meeting	SH