



Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise
11th BOARD MEETING
 Wednesday 26 February 2020 at 2.00pm
Spaces, Woking

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
 ES - Emma Strahan, Private Secretary and Business Support Officer (Minutes)
 RBm - Rupert Basham, Engagement Lead (Presenting)
 RBy - Rossy Bailey, Senior Analyst (Presenting)

Apologies:

SHy - Sheila Honey, Chief Analyst

Item No	Agenda Item	Minutes	Actions Agreed
1	Approval of previous minutes and matters arising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Previous minutes formally approved. - Actions from last minutes all completed. - No matters arising. 	

Item No	Agenda Item	Minutes	Actions Agreed
2	Project Update: Development Study	<p>- RBy presented the proposed aims, outputs and workstreams of the development study. She noted that the tender process for the study is now completed. Two bids were received. NatCen were awarded the contract and have a clear proposed plan for delivery. The timescales for the project were presented and agreed with the board.</p> <p>- RBy informed the board that the development of the new survey will have an overarching advisory board that will be made up of representatives from community groups around the UK, government, regulators, aviation industry, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), research specialists and acoustics specialists. The board will have information and options given to them at key milestones. The advisory board choices will then be brought to an ICCAN board with the project leads recommendations for final sign off.</p> <p>- RBy also noted that the advisory board meetings will be transparent and will have notes from each meeting published on our website. SH(c) asked for the Terms of Reference for the Advisory Board to be circulated to commissioners.</p> <p>- SK asked about lessons learnt for procurement as only two bids were received.</p> <p>- RL highlighted that other community groups might feel that the chosen community group representative that sits on the advisory board don't represent them or their views. HS noted that we are being transparent and other community groups can feedback through the AEF if needed.</p> <p>- RL asked that we ensure that the views of airports and airlines are also represented on the advisory board.</p> <p>- RL asked about when we will know about the projected costs of the main study? RBy stated that she would ensure that an estimate of cost is available as an early output from the development study.</p> <p>- RL asked if NatCen are then precluded from bidding for the main study? RBy said that all aspects of the study design and decision making will be shared to</p>	<p>RBy</p> <p>CA's</p>

OFFICIAL FOR PUBLICATION

2	Project Update cont: Development Study	ensure that anyone who chooses to bid is not at a disadvantage. - RL asked that the board's congratulations are minuted and that all actions were agreed by board.	
----------	---	---	--

3	Project Update: Consultation Toolkit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RBm and SC presented the scope of the Consultation Project and method of delivery to the board. The project work will be published in the form of a toolkit, which will take the form of an advisory suite of options. It will not be guidance, rather it is best practice. When applying to their processes, airports should be able to say how they have considered the options in the toolkit and why they have diverged from these if needed. - RBm reported that currently we have a survey running to seek feedback from the communities about their experiences with consultations and in addition we are running a consultation workshop for the airports to input from their perspective. The information gathered from these events will be used to feed into the project. - RBm reported that the toolkit will be available online and will be structured using the CAA's CAP1616 guidance. RBm detailed the content of the toolkit for the board. All proposals were agreed. - RL noted that we need to ensure the toolkit is relevant and applicable to all sizes of airports and all funding streams, noting that areas can be scaled up or scaled down as appropriate. - CN asked if we can view this project in the continual improvement space, giving options for comments which can be actioned in the future in a refresh, therefore allowing stakeholders to have further input following publication. - HS noted that he supported CN idea that it can be added to over time. - SH(c) noted that we need to bring something that is useful to communities and airports alike. It should be a way for communities to influence the end product. For example, if the CAA CAP 1616 guidance is the what and the ICCAN toolkit is the how. SC noted that the toolkit is designed to bring a certain level of clarity and consistency to the consultation process and the application of CAP 1616. - RBm reported that ICCAN wants to ensure a joined-up approach with other agencies. The CAA has been very supportive of the development of the toolkit and have openly shared information. ACOG have done the same. 	<p style="text-align: center;">None</p>
---	---	--	--

3	Project Update cont: Consultation Toolkit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RL added that the ICCAN toolkit clearly needs to support the decision-makers, and allow them to have all the information possible. - HS asked if we have looked outside of the UK for advice and examples of best practice and useful tools within the field of community engagement and consultation? RBm confirmed that we have, and would continue to do so on the engagement project. - SK asked if we need to get our legal team to review the wording of any potential questions or tools that we suggest ensuring that they are compliant with the consultation process. This was noted although it was agreed that since ICCAN is only publishing a toolkit to support delivery, rather than specific guidance, it would be up to the individual organisations to do the legal checking and clarity. 	
---	--	--	--

4	Project Update: Engagement Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RBm also presented an update on the Engagement Project. He noted that it will examine approaches and methodologies that are used by airports, the results most likely being case study based, picking out best practice. ICCAN will look at the role of the ACC's, Noise Action Plans and how airports can increase community engagement. - SH and RL reported that ICCAN will work with the HCEB and the UKACC secretariat to use their anticipated changes as a vehicle for our work. - The process and proposed project outputs were agreed by board. - RL noted that this project is relevant to the airports long term social capital. - SK asked should we look at the wording so some things will be key and others will be optional standards? RBm noted that the project will identify key things that have worked across the UK and a baseline for additional work to be built upon. 	SH+RL
---	---	--	--------------

5	Project Summary: Highlight Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EM presented the project highlight reports to the board. This is a new format which provides the board with a high-level summary of each project that isn't being presented in more detail at the meeting. EM clarified that the aim to have an oversight on progress and risks for each project. Feedback from board was that the report was very good and very useful. - Noise Metrics project report was discussed as it had the highest risk. Risk is high for delivery at the initially agreed scope. Report from the project leads indicates that a mitigating activity is to re-prioritise the scope, while still providing our best opinion at the time on metrics. - HS asked why the importance of publishing on time? Full board agreement that it supports the credibility of the organisation if we do what we said we were going to do when we said we were going to do it. SH(c) noted that this would be an external risk factor if this wasn't to happen. - Discussion around what additional clarity would we gain from having an extra three months? Would it change our conclusions, or would it just add additional evidence? Do we need the additional evidence if it has been done before? Does having a limited evidence base leave us open to risk of challenges? - CN noted that we could qualify our work as an initial opinion, leaving open the option to revisit should we see fit plus we could welcome comments and exchanges about the content. - SK stated that we could clarify about where we could add depth but also where we feel this wouldn't necessarily change our view. - RL noted that we can reserve the right to return to the issue. - HS asked who our targeted audience for the project report? What level of evidence or clarity do they need to feel satisfied? - SK noted that he believes that there is value in publishing in April as we said, even if it is a snapshot. 	<p style="text-align: center;">None</p>
---	--	--	--

5	Project Summary cont: Highlight Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- RL noted that the document will be an opinion on a framework that can be used. Not a definitive answer. - The board agreed to continue and publish the work at agreed scope but with reduced detailing in the evidence base if necessary.	
---	---	--	--

6	<p>Project Update: ICCAN's view on Regulation and our Future Role</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SH presented to the board that it is time to start formally forming a view on the issues around regulation as this will then shape the future of ICCAN. - SH referred the board to the document that we used at our inception to form our views on where ICCAN could be in the future. - Five models for what the future could look like were presented to the board. The stages of work needed for ICCAN to be able to form an informed opinion were also discussed. - EM noted that due to ICCAN resources, the first two stages of the work (desk research) will be put out for external contract. We will use an existing contract that exists within DfT to deliver this work. The process has already been started and the agreement is that this will be completed by the end of April. - RL noted that we are looking at this now because it has become clear that external stakeholders were unclear about the "and what" for ICCAN's future. - RL and HS noted that four out of five models would need serious resources added to ICCAN's secretariat if they were the final proposal. - SH(c) noted that although we should explore and evidence all the proposed options, we need to concentrate on the one that would be most beneficial for everyone. - Discussion around the risks and benefits of proposing that ICCAN takes responsibility and decision making from other organisations. HS asked can we achieve change if we were just being an advisor? - SH(c) asked from our initial two years in operation do we have a clear list of where the change needs to happen and what level of change needs to happen? - SK noted that ICCAN could provide independent advice and info to a regulator if needed. 	
---	--	---	--

6	Project Update cont: ICCANs view on Regulation and our Future Role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RL noted that we are not trying to work out if there is an issue, we know there is. What we need is strong government backing for our recommendations of the way forwards. - SK noted that if something isn't being done we need to be clear about who needs to do it and why. This can include recommending ourselves as the appropriate body. - SH(c) noted that we need to ensure that we think about what we call this piece of work – is regulation or the future of ICCAN the right thing? - RL noted that he should meet with SC to discuss the comms strategy about how ICCAN talks about the direction in which we are travelling. 	<p style="text-align: center;">CAs</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SC and RL</p>
---	---	--	---

7	Governance Update: Tailored Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ES presented information about tailored reviews, why they are carried out, the most likely steps and decisions that will be taken by the review team. - HS asked if the political landscape at the time change the perception of the reviewing team about ICCAN's work and its future? - RL noted that it would be useful to know who from the government will be asked about our work and the government's views on our progress. - SH(c) suggested we could develop a narrative about we are important to our stakeholders, using a storyboard to depict our progress and decision making. The storyboard should also demonstrate outcome messages and the changes we want to see for our stakeholders. - The board was informed of the most likely timetable for the report and sign off. - SH noted that he was confident that the review would be proportionate for the size and budget of the organisation and the outcomes will be positive and useful. - RL asked what happens if we don't agree with the outcomes and recommendations of the review – how will we challenge and who will support us? - The board requested that each of the areas of the review are RAG rated and presented at June board meeting. 	<p style="text-align: center;">ES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ES and AG</p>
---	---	--	--

8	People Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RBy and RBm presented to the board about the people surveys and why they are carried out. The results of both the DfT Aviation directorate and the internal ICCAN survey were presented. - RBy and RBm explained that these results had been analysed and qualitative responses had been sought from staff in order to qualified some of the numbers. They presented the results and some ideas for next steps. Clear actions for the secretariat need to be identified. - SH noted that the survey was completed by new staff in a new setting. Scores next year will be more reflective for the ICCAN team. - HS noted that ICCAN staff benefit from having a breath of experiences within the team and this should be clearly defined and recognised as a multitude of learning experiences. - RL noted that it is important to strive for positive outcomes and the board noted that they will make changes if required. 	RBy and RBm
9	Comms and Engagement update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SC presented an update on Comms and Engagement over the last month. Political engagement continues, consisting of meetings and written briefs for ministers. - SC reported that there has been some published support for ICCAN having statutory powers from several MPs, including Damian Hinds and David Simmonds. - External engagement with stakeholders continues and we have now started the one year on follow up meetings as well as continuing to meet new interested parties. - SH requested that commissioners use their contacts to positively promote ICCAN and our work. 	SH(c), HS, CN and SK

	Any other business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SK requested that ICCAN speak to HAL NEDG to provide clarity re the Noise Metrics project and the potential implications for them. - Regulation review to be removed from Forward Look for March as already completed. 	
		Date of next meeting: 25 March 2020 at 2pm, Woking office	

Signed

Robert Light
Head Commissioner

Actions Table

Item Number	Action	Owner
2	To circulate ToR for Advisory Board project	RBy
2	To get a ballpark figure of costs for the new noise attitudes study for Sam and Rob	CAs
4	To inform UKACC and HCEB about ICCANs intentions around our engagement project	SH
6	To consider what we should call the Regulation Project	CAs
6	To discuss comms strategy for how we are talking about the future direction of ICCAN	SC and RL
7	RAG rate the actions for the tailored review	AG and ES
7	Tailored review to go back to Board in June, add to forward look	AG
8	Clear actions for the secretariat need to be identified	RBy and RBm
9	Commissioners use their contacts to positively promote ICCAN	SH(c), HS, CN and SK
AOB	Regulation update to be removed from Forward Look for March	AG
AOB	To speak to HAL about ICCAN's noise metrics project and its implications for the NEDG	SH