



**Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise**  
**13th BOARD MEETING**  
 Wednesday 29 April 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)

**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 and formally approved.</li> <li>- Actions from last meeting all complete or to be addressed during the course of this meeting.</li> <li>Deferred actions from the February meeting were either completed or would return to the board at later meetings.</li> <li>- No matters arising and no declarations of interest.</li> </ul>	

Item No	Agenda Item	Minutes	Actions Agreed
2	COVID-19 update	<p><u>Work Programme</u></p> <p>-EM and SHy presented slides on the updated work programme due to C19. They highlighted that it was essential that the board understand that this is exploring the feasibility of each piece of work and this is not a prioritised work stream.</p> <p>-EM noted that C19 has had an impact on the Development Study timelines due to availability of stakeholders from DfT and changes to collection methods of data by the research agency.</p> <p>-RL said that he felt that the engagement work needs to be available sooner than November as we might need it before then. Regulation and Engagement will both get traction outside of aviation and so we need to separate the publication dates as much as possible and avoid December. EM acknowledged this and said that we would like to front load the work on several projects so that we can feed into other policy and publication work that will be happening in the autumn.</p> <p>-Several options for pieces of work were presented, with a risk benefit analysis. These were:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Department for Transport (DfT) longitudinal research – the expected benefit of participating in existing field work around behaviour and public transport is low as the respondent numbers are not enough to cover the specific area of aviation noise.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Bespoke survey – Ipsos Mori have confirmed that they can run a survey for us; it is more expensive than planned but would free up our resource so savings would be made there. Results will be robust and we can use them in the future. More credible as it is carried out by a well-regarded external research agency.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">In-house smart survey – Sample will be Facebook users only, data will not be robust. It will also be labour intensive for ICCAN staff and would impact on other tasks.</p>	

		<p>Ipsos Mori Omnibus – We could add questions but the sample is random and national and not targeted at those affected by aviation noise.</p> <p>Desk Research – Publicly available data all collated together on one spreadsheet which is limited by the data available at the time.</p> <p>SHy added that one other option is that ICCAN could design a survey to send out to airports that Ipsos Mori haven't spoken to and put it alongside their data as 'anecdotal'</p> <p>-CN noted there is a danger of our reputation for the last option as it might look like we asked Ipsos Mori to do the 'important' airports and then we did the rest.</p> <p>-SK noted that there is danger of overload of work and impact on us as we already have lots to do. In addition, a smart survey on Facebook will be discredited easily by other people as not using a representative sample.</p> <p>-RL agreed that there is less risk on us if the data is independent and we would have to work hard to separate our own surveys. Don't underplay the cost for us on doing it ourselves, there is the resource cost and the cost of us not being able to other work. RL asked that the secretariat ensure the internal resource cost is factored in.</p> <p>-SH added that the procurement of the Ipsos Mori work through DfT may be a risk because of the length of time it will take to get agreement to fund.</p> <p>-Summary of discussion: favoured option is bespoke survey by Ipsos Mori depending on the affordability and staff resource plus length of time of procurement process due to the importance of currency of the data, plus the mix of airports to be chosen.</p> <p>-Further options for quantitative data collation and analysis were presented, which were;</p> <p>Freight – Can get data from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) easily and so we can do this easily. How much freight is being moved? Are they converting passenger planes and using cabins as well as holds? What times of day are freight movements?</p>	EM/SHy
--	--	---	--------

		<p>Correlations between complaints and aircraft noise – consistent data not available so we couldn't progress with this. Although RL noted that this should be available from all airports on their websites and this is something we can look at in the future.</p> <p>Flight tracking – Working alongside the CAA to look at flight tracks, to see if pilots are being vectored by air traffic controllers to use different tracks since the end of normal operations and the start of COVID-19 to see if new communities are being overflowed or if fewer people are being overflowed but more often.</p> <p>-RL asked do we have evidence to say that this is happening? We need to ensure that we can use the data to change behaviours in the future before we allocate the resources.</p> <p>-SK asked if this data is available then it could be useful for the future for us. Given that this is an opportunity for airlines to use the 'perfect route' given the skies are clear then we could ask why they aren't using them.</p> <p>-The Board indicated that they were happy that ICCAN pursue the areas the team have highlighted and they will look to get an update at the next meeting.</p> <p>-SK added that the Institute of Acoustic (IOA) is encouraging its members to make recordings of ambient noise during lockdown. SK to link this back to SHy.</p> <p><u>Corporate Strategy – One Year Report</u></p> <p>-SH informed the board that the Corporate Strategy refresh will now be much shorter and might take the form of a blog from Rob on the website outlining the change in context. It will include a note about what we have done so far, it will include a message from the board about where we are going with our projects and then it will state the case for ICCAN's involvement in the rebuilding of the industry.</p> <p>-RL said that ICCAN should maintain a drip feed of our information and the importance of the issues. Our information will help to keep issues live in the debates</p>	<p>SC</p> <p>SC</p>
--	--	---	---------------------

		<p>later in the year. Perhaps we could send out a letter to airlines on fleet use as they recover?</p> <p>-SH(c) agreed that the time is now for us to start raising our flag and setting out our stall for the recovery process of the industry.</p> <p>-CN noted that the slow restart gives them an opportunity to do things differently but the focus will be rebuilding their business so we need to show the value of thinking about noise and carbon.</p> <p>-RL stated that we need to try and influence and monetise the consequences of not thinking about noise issues and the consequences of not taking actions. We should try and frame it as investment for the future.</p> <p>-CN asked will there be a greater reaction to aviation when it returns? Will there be a change of attitudes towards the purpose for travel as well as the frequency of flights? Communities are already asking why planes are flying.</p> <p>- SK noted that if there is significantly reduced capacity for passengers on each flight then will there need to be scope for more night flights to spread people across the day? Will this be a potential new issue?</p> <p>-SH(c) noted that there is some anecdotal evidence that people who had not noticed flight noise before are now noticing improvements in their sleep.</p> <p>-Board agreed that we start to drip feed the messages around the noise agenda.</p> <p>- CN highlighted that we could get a lot of traction on our work in the media as people will be interested.</p> <p>- SK suggested that as part of our comms work over the next few months we could produce FAQ answers for community groups/media and airlines around noise and its impacts.</p>	
--	--	--	--

3	<b>Work Programme: Project Highlights Report</b>	<p>-EM presented the slides and noted that the project completion dates have been extended as discussed in last board. We have some problems with our external providers as their resources have been impacted. Some stakeholders are difficult to engage with due to being busy with their COVID-19 response or not being convened. Our external QA process is delayed on the noise metrics project, but will still be complete in time for publication in June.</p> <p>-RL noted that the Consultation Toolkit ought to be published at the most appropriate time and this should be decided by the team. SH indicated that ICCAN will stay on timetable for publishing the toolkit for now, however the airspace change process is delayed and no airports are doing consultation at present. CAP1616 may be changed due to it being resource heavy and the implication this has for airports that are trying to rebuild their business. Therefore, the need for our toolkit may change. A draft will be sent to commissioners as requested at last board over the next couple of weeks.</p> <p>-EM highlighted that with regards to regulation the team have worked closely with NatCen to develop the framework against which other regulatory approaches will be reviewed. This is based on the NAO's spectrum of regulatory interventions, to better align with how other areas of public policy approach regulation.</p> <p>-SH(c) requested that ICCAN liaises with government about the upcoming autumn policies, Brexit etc and their workload. ICCAN needs to publish at a time when our work can be taken into consideration by our stakeholders.</p> <p>-RL noted that perhaps we can release emerging recommendations, arguments and tasters from our projects rather than full reports.</p> <p>-Board agreed to accept the highlight reports.</p>	<p>SC</p> <p>SC</p>
---	--	---	---------------------

4	Comms and Engagement: Quarterly Report and future strategy	<p>Quarterly Report</p> <p>-SC presented his report slides which show that ICCAN hit the ground running in 2020 and we were busy with engagements across our stakeholder profile from January right through to the stay at home message in March.</p> <p>-The website is being accessed well and users are from across the world as well as the UK. People are accessing the documents and there are clear spikes when we publish reports.</p> <p>-MP engagement letter had good results and there had been some good high-profile media highlights. RL noted that we have now met with MPs from the four largest political parties and we have received expressed support for our work.</p> <p>Future Planning due to C19</p> <p>-SC presented slides to outline how we are going to update ICCAN's stakeholders, support and promote ICCAN's research, raise a debate about what the future looks like, promote ICCAN's publications, publish and promote new content and maintain relationships with MPs and other politicians.</p> <p>-SH(c) noted that some of our media messages need to be carefully planned for the industry. We need to be encouraging them to retire aircraft with a positive message for them. The value of long-range aircraft has reduced and the value for other smaller short-range aircraft has increased. Could we do a think piece around this as there is data available?</p> <p>-HS asked if we could think about an investigative documentary programme, to do a piece on aircraft noise, that lack of it has possible improvements to people sleep or health? CN and RL noted that whilst a valuable idea, this could be risky if the programme reached a conclusion that we don't agree with or cannot endorse. Therefore, while ICCAN might respond to a programme we wouldn't initiate it.</p> <p>-SK acknowledged that our comms could be about agenda setting. We could say that this is an opportunity for the airlines and airports to show that when they are not constrained by their limits,</p>	
---	--	--	--

		they can show that they can use the noise preferential routes and demonstrate the balanced approach.	
--	--	--	--

5	Governance Update: Budget and Risk Register	<p>Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AG presented the budget update from last year and for the new financial year.</li> <li>- HS noted that it was positive that further budget had been found to somewhat make up for the inability to spend in the last financial year. HS asked if this shows that we can afford the piece of work by Ipsos Mori? SH confirmed that yes this is the case.</li> <li>- Budget report accepted by board, who asked to see the complete finalised accounts at their next meeting.</li> </ul> <p>Risk Register</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AG presented the risk register which has been updated due to COVID-19. There were several new high-level risks which have brought to the attention of board.</li> <li>-RL re C1 We cannot yet state that our actions are mitigating and therefore the live score is too low. It should remain high.</li> <li>-Re C2 the board asked that the word 'reinforces' is changed as the current wording wrongly reflects the current situation.</li> <li>-RL re C3 we need to ensure that we are engaging face to face as soon as Government advice permits; however, if we are still in this situation later in the year we need to revise our planning and consider the long-term impact of low-level non-face to face engagement.</li> <li>-SK re P3 Column G needs to say something different than column L. Mitigating activities need to be amended.</li> <li>- Risk register approved by board with agreed amendments.</li> </ul>	AG
---	--	---	----

	<p><b>Board Forward Look and any other business</b></p>	<p><u>Forward Look</u></p> <p>Agreed by board.</p> <p><u>Staff update</u></p> <p>-SH gave an update of the recent recruitment campaigns. The G7 Senior Analyst position received 34 applications and we are pleased with the quality of the applications received. The SEO Policy Adviser position received 73 applications and again we are pleased with the quality of applications received. Sifting is taking place over the next two weeks, with interviews to follow.</p> <p>-Once we have appointed these posts, we will be able to go out to advert to fill the recent vacancy in the Comms team.</p>	
		<p><b>Date of next meeting: 27 May 2020 at 2pm, via video conference</b></p>	

Signed

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

Actions Table

Item Number	Action	Owner
2	ICCAN resource for project work to be mapped	EM/SHy
2	Letter to airlines to be drafted	SC
2	One-year update for the Corporate Strategy to be drafted	SH
3	Draft of toolkit to be sent to commissioners	SC
3	Initial 'tasters' of project recommendations to be included in summer engagement activities	SC
5	Amends made to risk register	AG