

Meeting Minutes

Project Title	Biggin Hill 21 RNAV ACP (ACP-2019-86)
Client/Sponsor	London Biggin Hill Airport (LBHA)
Purpose of Meetings	Post Gateway 2 Feedback part 1 and part 2
Date of Meetings	30 th June 2021 and 8 th July 2021
Held at	Virtual Conference (MS Teams)
Present	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Copies to	Listed above
Classification	Commercial in Confidence until Release
Osprey Reference	71372/016
Issue	Final [REDACTED]

This document is of UK origin and has been prepared by Osprey Consulting Services Limited (Osprey) and, subject to any existing rights of third parties, Osprey is the owner of the copyright therein. The document is furnished in confidence under existing laws, regulations and agreements covering the release of data. This document contains proprietary information of Osprey and the contents, or any part thereof shall not be copied or disclosed to any third party without Osprey's prior written consent.

© Osprey Consulting Services Limited 2021



Meeting Summary

Item	Action
<p>1.1 – Purpose of the meeting</p> <p>The meeting was necessary to discuss the feedback from the CAA regarding the Gateway 2 document submission. The CAA response document, on the portal states:</p> <p>This ACP is not approved for progression to Stage 3 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The application of the Sponsor’s set constraints and Design Principles during the options development is not clearly explained which leads to inconsistencies. 2) A lack of a clearly defined base-line option leading to confused analysis in the Initial Options Appraisal. 3) Transparency – The Sponsor does not include all the relevant stakeholder responses in their submission. 4) Clarity and Consistency – some of the statements/explanations lack the required detail such that the reader has to make assumptions regarding how options have been developed through Stage 2. The descriptions and statements necessary to understand the impacts/benefits of some options and how they have been developed differ or contradict between documents. 5) The narrative regarding how the Sponsor responded to stakeholder feedback is lacking and does not explain how some responses (feed-back) was understood and accounted for. <p>█ opened the meeting and █ stated that LBHA is keen to progress the ACP and understand how to achieve that.</p>	
<p>1.2 – Extrapolation of the feedback</p> <p>█ explained that the 5 feedback points are based on the following CAP 1616 references:</p> <p><u>CAP1616 – Para 128</u></p> <p>The sponsor omitted to address the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the design options against the design principles in a fair and consistent manner. • The evaluated design options are compliant with the required technical criteria. • Ensured, as far as possible, that stakeholders are satisfied that the design options are aligned with the design principles and sponsors to set out how decisions they have taken relate to stakeholder feed-back. <p><u>CAP1616 - Para 133 - Appendix E – Para E12 and E21</u></p> <p>The sponsor is not clear and consistent in addressing the following criteria:</p>	

Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline should be clear – what is the effect of the ‘do minimum’ in relation to current circumstances. • The refining of options using criteria. • Providing an indicator of the likely noise impact(s). – (Note - This would have been a recommendation for the Sponsor and not a reason for not progressing to Stage 3.) <p>When assessing the suggested options against the Design Principles, the criteria adopted was not clear and consistently applied. In some cases, options were discounted at 2A when these options did not meet DP/criteria requirements but in other cases options that did not meet the DP/criteria requirements were progressed to Step B. The reason for the difference in treatment was not articulated.</p>	
<p>1.3- Feedback examples to aid re-submission</p> <p>The CAA provided some examples to help explain their reasoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] - DP5 - mentions operational complexity as part of the criteria used during development, yet in the DPE it is only mentioned at Option 11. • [REDACTED] - The CAA suggested that the Sponsor, based on the intent of the defined criteria as described in the documentation (such as DP1), could have discounted some other options before the DPE in the same way that Options 3 and 4 were discounted. Specific examples being all the C options and all the T options along with appropriate narratives. If the Sponsor, wanted to take the C and T options into the DPE, then this was acceptable, however, a clearer explanation as to why they were not discounted before the DPE, should have been included. • [REDACTED] - The storytelling regarding the current operation should be clearer and more actively support the fact that the current VOR procedure is rarely used. This should be re-told in the baseline explanation in the IOA explaining that the only change will be from the rarely used VOR to the rarely used RNAV and that everything else remains extant, including a point raised b[REDACTED] that the airport has no control over the usage of the inbound procedures as these are handled by NATS. • [REDACTED] - The CAA Suggested that the sponsor could be more specific in terms of noise reduction for the options with an increased angle of descent. [REDACTED] stated that published work was referenced and that modelled outcomes would come from the FOA in Stage 3. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] cautioned over the use of phrases “small reduction” and “more favourable” suggesting they could be misleading, especially if the Sponsor believes that the actual reduction in noise will not be noticeable • [REDACTED] - Within the submission, the sponsor hasn’t clearly explained their engagement methodology, nor provided raw evidence for the CAA to make an assessment whether the requirements of the process have been met. The CAA had to contact the sponsor twice with clarification 	

Item	Action
<p>questions. More storytelling is necessary regarding the engagement approach during this stage and stakeholder responses to engagement whether by email or in the Focus Groups. It should be shown explicitly how the feedback was used and what decisions the sponsor has taken in light of that stakeholder feedback, for instance, “we took feedback from XXX and discounted option x and y.” ■ said that she felt the CAA were not consistent regarding this element of the process and cited an example of where stakeholder feedback had not been published at Stage 2. The CAA present at this meeting said that they were not in a position to comment on the example cited; however, the CAA confirmed that their approach had also developed as more ACPs had progressed since the inception of CAP1616 and that the current default position was that <u>relevant</u> stakeholder feedback should be published, as it informed the development of options and would be reviewed by the CAA. The CAA noted the point raised by Osprey.</p> <p>LBHA accepted that a written report received from NATS, will be included in a revised document set.</p>	
<p>1.5 – Part 1 AOB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ explained that the regulator was aware of the issues that Stage 2 was causing generally and that a CAP1616 review is underway, together with the desire to produce some guidance as soon as possible. ■ welcomed this approach and suggested that engagement with those actually grappling with CAP 1616 would be very useful to that review. ■ raised the issue of the current VOR rationalisation date, and questioned what would happen if it was changed, for instance, aligned with the AMS, would all the CAP 1616 work in this ACP have to be re-done as it could change the baseline? ■ The CAA suggested that this would be out of the control of the sponsor and should be explained to stakeholders but should not require work to be re-done unless there was a material impact on the proposal. In this case the Sponsor is using a do-minimum option as the baseline, which is not related to the use of the VOR. If, however, the Sponsor was to discover that the VOR was to remain in service well beyond the Dec 22 deadline, then the Sponsor must act with transparency and discuss their response with the CAA. 	
<p>1.6 –Part 2 IOA feedback</p> <p>■ provided some examples of where the CAA saw inconsistencies and need for re-work within the IOA document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> He expanded on the need for the baseline to be defined in a clearer way, including the fact that the vectoring of the inbound traffic is handled by Thames Radar and solely within their gift, not that of LBHA, and that this will not change. 	

Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 4.3 needs to provide more explanation as to why options 5 and 7 have been discounted. • The high-level safety assessment needs to make plain the fact that as Option 2 has different lateral options, that the safety assessment covers all of these. In addition, Option 6’s assessment needs to be clearer. • Page 21, para 7.1 contains information on track mileage; the statements within the options appraisal need to be clearer to show whether the track mileage mentioned is in addition to the baseline or not. <p>Further examples were provided relating to the spreadsheet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CAA suggested that the wording related to Capacity and Resilience, “not efficient” was probably not appropriate. ■ suggested that perhaps the phrase “not designed with efficiency in mind” would be better. • The Safety Assessments refer to Communications Failure, ■ said it was not clear if this was the main hazard and/or whether it was being changed or not. ■ explained that there is no more concern regarding this than in today’s operation. ■ stated that clarity on page 19 was required. • ■ suggested that the reasoning for keeping Option 12 was not strong enough, as there was not a clear explanation in earlier documentation as to why it failed the DPE, yet still progressed. • ■ stated that the IOA table should have a column for Do Nothing even though it is not being used as the baseline (see para E21 – CAP1616), this was reiterated by ■. ■ explained that he had compiled the spreadsheet on the basis that the reader would know this from the IOA document that should be read first. • ■ highlighted inconsistencies with the descriptions of the environmental criteria, citing that the definition of Tranquillity at 4.2.2 differs from that in CAP1616 Appendix B. In addition to this ■ suggested that the sponsor revisits its local air quality assessment to ensure that all AQMAs that may be impacted by this ACP have been identified. • ■ also highlighted the sponsor’s noise assessment on page 20 para 6.1, querying why all of the contributors to noise exposure identified by the sponsor were not provided within the IOA analysis. ■ explained that he would address this question after the meeting. • ■ suggested that it would be helpful to consistently reference where the aircraft will begin descent if this is where a measurable change could occur, and ■ suggested referencing CAP 1498 when referring to overflight. • ■ questioned whether the biodiversity definitions across the submission aligned and suggested that more explanation is provided within the IOA with respect to biodiversity impacts. 	

Item	Action
<p>A discussion was had regarding terminology of Comprehensive List, Viable Comprehensive List, Long List, Short List as CAP 1616 is arguably difficult to follow regarding this terminology. The CAA suggested the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive list of options including radical options, whittled down fairly/consistently through criteria/constraints (para E18/E19) to a Suitable List of options, whittled down through the DPE to a (Comprehensive) List of Viable (i.e. safe) options, whittled down through the IOA to a Short List of options including the preferred option. 	
<p>1.7 - Part 2 AOB.</p> <p>█ asked about Gateway availability, █ suggested that a decision would take about a week on receipt of the submission form.</p> <p>█ asked who he should contact to initiate CAP 1781. MG said he would investigate. █ provided a response by email.</p> <p>█ asked about the impact of CAP 1781 if LBHA elected to initiate it. █ said he would investigate. █ provided a response by email.</p>	<p>█ to submit paperwork.</p>