

GATWICK AIRPORT NOISE MANAGEMENT BOARD (NMB/14)

Wednesday 8th May 2019 - Hilton Hotel Gatwick

Meeting Minutes

Welcome and Introductions

1. The Chairman opened the fourteenth meeting of the Gatwick Airport Noise Management Board, recording that this was the last full meeting of the NMB in its first 3-year Term. He welcomed the participants and noted one apology for absence.
2. On behalf of NMB the Chair specifically welcomed Sally Franks, the newly appointed General Manager of ANS. The Chair also noted, that NMB for the first time had the privilege of hosting three representatives from the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN), who were joining the meeting to observe proceedings. Head Commissioner Robert Light was joined at NMB/14 by ICCAN Secretary Sam Hartley and Commissioner Simon Henley, who is the ICCAN focal point for Gatwick.
3. The Chair, moving on to the business of the day, then thanked the members of the NMB Review Committee for their diligent and collaborative work over the past eight months on behalf of the NMB. He highlighted the Committee's work on the Review, which was reported to NMB in November. The Chair noted that an important topic for the meeting is discussion of the subsequent and detailed development work undertaken by the Committee for structural and governance changes to the NMB. These reflect the findings, feedback and the negotiated views of the Committee, which they have proposed for the NMB.
4. During his introduction, the NMB Chairman also referred to additional topics central to discussions at NMB/14, which had developed further since the prior meeting of the Board in January, including:
 - a. The practical aspects of a proposed transition to the new governance arrangements provided by the Review Committee in its report to the NMB Chair. The guidance identifies several areas where further consideration will be required by the new NMB as a part of the transition, its constitution and, for the operation of the NMB's second term.
 - b. As regards its noise reduction work, the NMB Implementation Report included information on the 2019/20 Workplan. Also included is an extensive list of NMB meetings and workshops, which he acknowledged, underscores the level of time and effort involved for all concerned, a significant consideration for community representatives in particular, who are obliged to give up their own time in order to participate.
 - c. Participants were also provided with a copy of a consolidated summary of NMB Noise Initiatives that had been progressively reported to NMB throughout its first 3-year term.
5. NMB approved the agenda for (NMB/14 WP01), having agreed an adjustment in the sequence for discussion of the NMB transition, a change proposed by CL.

Agenda item 1: Approval of the Minutes of NMB/13

6. The draft Minutes of NMB/13 were opened for comment. The Secretary reported that the edits proposed by e-mail to the preliminary draft had been incorporated into the draft minutes as appropriate (NMB/14 WP02).
7. One further alteration to the draft minute of NMB/13 was proposed and agreed by NMB, the minute was then approved, adopted and are now published on the NMB web pages.
8. The Secretary also reported that regarding the NMB Ad-Hoc Meeting held in March and as advised at the time, Minutes of discussions were not taken. The information submitted by the Review Committee to NMB for the Ad-Hoc meeting was provided to NMB and discussed on the day, with all NMB Members being asked to report any feedback in March, in writing only and directly to the Review Committee. This feedback was used by the Committee for their further work in developing their final constitutional and governance recommendations to NMB/14.

Agenda item 2: Review of Matters arising from NMB/13

9. The Secretary reported that each of the Actions arising from NMB/13 are, where possible, completed in accordance with the agreed timetable and closed. Any written material arising has been distributed to NMB using the Information Paper mechanism. Where a need for further discussion and strategic direction is a consequence of the NMB/13 actions, the topics are included in the agenda of NMB/14 or noted below.
10. SP reported that although not a specific Action item from NMB/13, but related to the briefing provided to NMB on the new Noise and Track Keeping (NTK) system, CAGNE has experienced some challenges with the new system, particularly the ease of use and some functionality. AS thanked CAGNE and agreed that GAL is aware of some issues related to the initial introduction of the new service; he reported that as these are being identified they are being resolved by the service provider. The phase 2 implementation, due this summer, would see further incremental improvements to complementary information and data made available through the website. Meanwhile GAL encouraged all NMB members who wished to do so, to send AS feedback related to use of the new NTK system, so that it may be taken into account.
11. Three Actions from NMB/13 remain open:
 - a. NMB/13 Action 3, Helios to convene a meeting with CNG to discuss RNN conditions and responses.
 - b. NMB/13 Action 6, NMB Secretary and Review Committee were tasked to propose membership for a Standards and Ethics Committee of the NMB. Following further discussion at the Review Committee, it was concluded that while the issue remains an important consideration, the establishment of a Standards and Ethics Committee by the outgoing NMB was not appropriate, accordingly the Action is deferred to the newly constituted NMB to address.
 - c. NMB/13 Action 7, GAL to advise when the LHR work impacting Route 3 has been completed and, if available, to provide access to the report. The LHR work is ongoing, the Action therefore remains open¹

¹ a. [Post meeting note. The Heathrow Steeper departures trial has been completed and the full report is available via the link:
https://www.heathrow.com/file_source/HeathrowNoise/Static/Heathrow_DET09_Steeper_Departure_Trial_Final_Report_V1_0_May_2019.pdf].

Agenda item 3: Completion of NMB 1st Term

12. A hard copy of the Noise Management Board First term report was provided (NMB/14 IP10). The Secretary introduced the Report, which amalgamates language from the Independent Review of Arrivals, published in January 2016, the subsequent Action Plan published by GAL and overseen by NMB as its initial Workplan through 2018, together with the latest NMB Implementation Report, the latter using the format routinely provided to NMB and which details the current status of the NMB Work Plan items.
 - a. Several CNG members commented negatively on the report, in which they remarked that it was 'unexpected' and provided a 'rose tinted' perspective, noting that the report had not been discussed with NMB and was neither an accurate nor objective account of NMB activities in their view. CNG suggested that if the report were to be an official account of the NMB first term, then it should be discussed and approved by NMB.
 - b. NM, who as usual led the discussion on the Implementation Report, together with the Chair and Secretary, each separately reiterated that the NMB 1st Term Report contains no new information, that all the issues contained in the report are factually and objectively based, have previously been discussed with NMB and, reflect the final position reached on all completed items. As per every other NMB meeting, the latest implementation update, reported by Industry and the WISG relates to on-going NMB work topics. This is also provided as part of the NMB/14 IP10 Report.
 - c. The Chair agreed that what has been provided is a straightforward summary of NMB work to date together with the current Work Plan activity. Each of the items addressed in the report already take into account views expressed by NMB members.
 - d. SP reported that she was disheartened by the 2016 reference to the ADNID trial recorded in the 1st term Report (taken from the Arrivals Review publication). The Secretary emphasised that the reference is a factual record of the genesis of the NMB (Arrivals Review Section 1.2) provided as context to previous NMB activity.
 - e. GAL and HC proposed that to address the concerns expressed by some CNG Members, that the NMB Chair provide a covering note to accompany the Report be described as the Chair's report and include as an integral part of the report a letter or note from the NMB Chair making clear that it has *been provided to NMB*, it is not a report *approved by NMB*. **NMB/14 Action 01**
 - f. In context of the above discussion, the Secretary referred to the outstanding obligation on NMB, arising from the Review Committee, to conduct an analysis of NMB Communications. While the related action has been deferred by the Review Committee to the newly constituted NMB, GL observed that the discussion on the NMB 1st Term Report highlights that to avoid misunderstanding, there is a need for improved clarity when communicating NMB topics.
 - g. No other comments on the 1st Term report were noted.
13. NM briefed NMB on the current status of NMB Work Plan items (contained in the Report NMB/14 IP10)
 - a. NM reported that a review of *Noise Abatement Departure Procedures* (NADP 1 & NADP 2) was conducted to establish whether one procedure had better noise benefits for communities around Gatwick compared to the other. The initial analysis concluded that the majority of Gatwick departures already fly NADP 2 procedures,

and that moving from one procedure to another would simply relocate noise from one location to another. The NMB noted that it would be unlikely that there could be significant noise benefit from any standardisation of NADP procedures at Gatwick. To70 (RU) had previously reported that a study of findings at Amsterdam Schiphol had indicated different results from those reported by CAA ERCD in the UK. NM reported that work is therefore continuing to resolve how the apparently different findings have arisen, and will identify whether as a result there could be any potential benefit at Gatwick.

- b. Ongoing detailed planning work has continued on the *Airline Noise League Table*, with an expected launch date planned for Q4 2019. In collaboration with airlines, GAL has identified a number of operational and strategic metrics which will be monitored and regularly reported. The Table is intended to help residents to track individual airline noise performance and the effectiveness of continuous operational improvements.
- c. The NMB is continuing to progress plans for a *Reduced Night Noise (RNN) trial*. The primary objective of the trial is to assess the extent that PBN technology can be used to deliver noise benefits (to arriving aircraft) during the night period by reducing the number of aircraft flying unduly noisy profiles and/or flying at unnecessarily low altitudes, thus reducing the number of people disturbed. Significant engagement with the NMB and industry has taken place since early 2017 to develop the RNN trial concept and to address community concerns. GAL submitted the Statement of Need and Trial Plan required by the CAA in late 2018, a formal CAA Assessment Meeting was conducted with CAA in March 2019. Detailed planning continues, NM reported that the consultation requirements for such a trial, set out in CAP 1616, have already been met or exceeded. GAL has also commenced the necessary technical consultations with industry stakeholders, which includes a survey of individual airline operator capabilities, as well as a Technical Workshop with aircraft operators and air traffic control providers. The RNN trial is currently expected to begin in Q1 2020.
 - i. Both SP and AF asked that when the RNN tracks have been determined for the trial, that they can be provided to NMB using a map of sufficient topographical detail to permit accurate determination of the location of actual routes and the vertical profiles that have been defined for the trial.

NMB/14 Action 2

- d. NM then reported on the 2017 initiative proposing the development in the UK of a new *Low Noise Arrival Metric* to complement the current CDA definition and provide an additional performance measure for Gatwick and all UK airports. The Gatwick NMB led work, which is now also under the auspices of the UK's Future Airspace Strategy (FAS) is being conducted by CAA (ERCD), with NATS supporting and Sustainable Aviation sponsorship. Detailed noise analysis and testing of the proposed KPI is underway, with reporting of the results set after modelling has been completed for a sufficient number of aircraft types. This is now expected in late 2019. Validation of the new metric at Gatwick has been included in the 2019/2020 NMB Workplan as a follow-on activity.
- e. SP made a remark about Continuous Climb Operations (CCO) underscoring the CAGNE view that planes gaining altitude more quickly could benefit communities, but that steeper climb gradients could potentially increase noise closer to the airport. AS agreed, affirming that actual noise performance is being taken into

account. He reiterated that a CCO objective is already in the NMB Workplan and, that improving the achievement of CCO is one objective of the UK Future Airspace Strategy being pursued by GAL and other stakeholders.

14. The Secretary provided a short overview of the NMB Workshop planned for June 12th (since postponed).
 - a. The first workshop session of the day will be allocated to a presentation and demonstration, by the GAL Airspace Office, of the new Noise and Track Keeping System recently introduced by Gatwick. Delegates will be able to pose questions about the system, its rollout and functionality, and will have the opportunity to try hands-on use of the system with the GAL team.
 - b. The second session of the day will be led by TRAX International and will focus on the recently completed feasibility and options analysis of Gatwick Departure Routes, part of the 2018 NMB Workplan for departing aircraft. This follows on from the Route 3 analysis reported to NMB last year, with a written update at NMB/13 in January. The remaining departure routes (1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9) have now been analysed by Trax. The findings will be presented, demonstrated and discussed at the Workshop. It is expected that the new Noise and Track Keeping system will be used to support the practical illustration of these findings, together with radar replays of traffic scenarios.
 - c. MW asked whether the dispersal of aircraft on route 3 could be discussed at the Workshop, GAL confirmed that it could be included.
 - d. MW raised the issue of the accountability of NaTMAG, AS confirmed that NaTMAG is chaired by GAL and reports to GATCOM.
 - e. SP remarked that CAGNE had been unable to elicit any responses from NaTMAG related to several enquiries that had been raised. AS advised that NaTMAG report to GATCOM and that any enquiries from CNG should be handled by the GATCOM Environment and Amenity Groups representative.
15. NM then provided NMB with an overview of the outcomes of NMB discussions over the past year related to the development of a new Workplan. He reported that the NMB strategy embodied within the (unconfirmed) *2019/2020 Workplan* focuses on achieving and sustaining a downward trend in noise disturbance and in the numbers of noisier flights; so-called outliers. These incremental noise reductions will be achieved through further improvements to operational and engagement strategies, and through the practical validation of new and innovative technologies and operational techniques, themselves designed to reduce noise disturbance from every flight.
 - a. NMB was provided with two papers (IP11 and IP13) setting out the full details and outcomes of discussions planning changes to the Workplan. The first paper presents the (unconfirmed) 2019/2020 Workplan based on discussions at the NMB Workshop (August 2018) and additional feedback received, which has been developed into a proposed set of tasks.
 - b. The NMB/14 paper IP13 additionally provides the extensive list of all the potential Workplan items that were proposed by various NMB representatives and considered for potential inclusion in the Draft 2019/2020 NMB Workplan since August 2018. The paper provides traceability so that ideas are not lost and that any reasons for inclusion/exclusion in the final (unconfirmed) plan is recorded.
 - c. A wide range of activity has been undertaken by the NMB to understand community perspectives and to explore the technical, procedural and institutional opportunities to deliver further noise reductions and other noise mitigation measures.

- d. The activities captured target both arrivals and departing flights and can be progressed within and beyond the lifetime of the plan, which is based on the outcomes of the Workplan workshop and additional comments received from NMB Members.
- e. These activities have been developed into a set of organised tasks, which also take into account the Airport's Noise Action Plan that has now been adopted by DEFRA. The (unconfirmed) 2019/2020 NMB Workplan includes a number of continuing activities from the previous workstream, and the potentially viable options resulting from analysis of the feasibility of additional measures proposed by community and other members of the NMB.
- f. NM recommended that the (unconfirmed) NMB Workplan continue to be a 'living document' both recording developments in the plan and those areas where further work is needed to reach consensus on particular activities and priorities.
- g. When the items in the Workplan are formally agreed by the new Noise Management Board, the implementation detail for each task will be further developed.

Agenda item 4: NMB Review Final Report and Recommendations.

16. The Chairman said that the Noise Management Board's review of its functions and the potential need for changes to the NMB constitution was commenced in April 2018. In July 2018, Community Noise Groups published a letter stating that they had lost confidence in the ability of the NMB as currently constituted and led to deliver positive and timely change in the noise environment around Gatwick. Because this letter also informed addressees that CNG were no longer able to support a Board that is not achieving to which we all subscribed when it was created, alternative CNG representatives were therefore sought for the NMB. This led to a clarification of the position taken by the CNG Members, who then made it clear that "the CNG members of the NMB have not resigned and we currently wish to serve out our initial term", the initial term of the NMB closed at NMB/14.
- a. In response to the July 2018 CNG letter, the Board established a Review Committee, which began its work in September to consider all aspects of the Noise Management Board's work and membership. The Committee was chaired by the Member for Surrey County Council, with initial NMB representatives from; West Sussex County Council, Gatwick Airlines (ANS until Jan 2019) and GAL. Community Noise Groups were asked to nominate a representative, but were unable to unanimously agree which of their number should represent CNG views. To ensure that CNG views were included, the Committee then accepted as the CNG member, the nomination of the CNG majority.
 - b. SP indicated that CAGNE did not support a community representative being on the Review Committee, CAGNE do not believe that the geographical imbalance that has impacted NMB discussions over the past three years could be addressed effectively if a single CNG represented CNG views on the Committee.
 - c. The Review Committee, including its majority appointed CNG representative, provided the NMB with a report of their findings in November 2018, and, upon further request from the NMB, new governance reflecting the review's findings was developed by the Committee. This was fully consulted and provided to the Board at the beginning of May 2019 in time for discussion at this meeting of the NMB.
 - d. Before inviting the Committee Chair to introduce the Committee's recommended governance for NMB, the NMB Chair thanked the Committee for their work in drawing a line under the first term of the NMB, acknowledging the contributions of

the CNG representative, Industry and both the Chair and Vice Chair of the Review Committee. He then invited Committee members to comment.

- i. In his role as CNG rep on the Review Sub-committee, AF provided his feedback on the review process, confirming disappointment and frustration that, after 6 months of effort, the Sub-committee was tabling a report written very much in support of the Gatwick position, which failed to take account of much of the CNG feedback and left key issues unresolved. AF also highlighted that, apart from the CNGs, there was too little challenge to “the Gatwick view” and that the document produced lacked the ambition required to drive real noise reduction. AF also commented that the NMB had already tried the Work Plan initiative which had largely failed to deliver results and that without the focus and accountability provided by meaningful noise reduction targets we would see more of the same, with little return for our joint efforts.
- ii. LK disagreed with AF, indicating that in her view the Committee had done a good job of identifying and discussing all of the issues and, had reached compromise wherever possible, as had been made clear in their report to NMB.
- iii. HC expressed disappointment with the remarks made by AF, saying that the Committee had worked hard to address a very wide range of complex and difficult issues for which there are no simple answers.
- iv. TM thanked the Committee for good and constructive discussions and indicated that the positive outcomes reported by the Committee had been agreed by all members. Also noting that any areas with remaining differences of view, had been identified, respected and reported to NMB.

17. HC, the Member for Surrey County Council and Chair of the NMB Review Committee, was then invited by the NMB Chair to introduce the Committee’s governance proposals to NMB. (NMB/14 WP04)

- a. HC reported that following the publication of the Review Committee’s findings and recommendations in November 2018, and the Committee’s further report at the January NMB/13 meeting, the Committee undertook to develop proposals for NMB governance.
- b. HC reported that the Committee has consulted widely and has sought to deliver a pragmatic basis for the collaborative and inclusive development of aircraft noise reduction strategies at Gatwick.
- c. Preliminary draft Terms of Reference prepared by the Committee were presented to an Ad-Hoc meeting of the NMB on March 13th when written feedback was sought from NMB Members and a wider range of Community Noise Groups. Comprehensive and varied feedback was received, that was carefully considered by the Committee, which met several times following the March Ad-Hoc, in order to finalise its NMB governance proposals.
- d. The Committee, through preparing its final governance recommendations, sought to build consensus when tackling the differences of approach advocated in the feedback received. While this yielded constructive outcomes, there remained some differences of opinion amongst Committee members relating to several areas of the final recommended Terms of Reference.

- e. The Committee therefore recommended to NMB that the Terms of Reference that have been developed are used as a basis for the establishment of the new NMB, subject, in no particular order, to the following considerations:
 - i. The CNG representation feel that the key purpose of the NEX does not go far enough and wish to establish the NEX as a noise target setting body. GAL on the other hand, take the view that the key purpose of the NEX should be the development and delivery of specific noise reduction initiatives linked to “SMART” objectives (including, where possible, estimated noise reductions per initiative).
 - ii. The Committee was not able to resolve the mechanisms by which the requirement for balanced community representation will be achieved and maintained on the NCF, or the appropriate NCF representation on the NEX. The Committee recommends that responsibility for ensuring the fair balance of community/industry/elected representation is assigned to the Chairs of the NEX and the NCF.
 - iii. The Committee has already recommended a review of NMB related communications. Clear and effective communication will play a critical role in developing the open and transparent environment required to ensure the future success of any new NMB structure. The Committee’s proposal to establish a Communications Working Group, to review internal and external NMB related communication, should be conveyed to the new structure for action.
 - iv. The Committee recommends that the new NMB forms a standing Standards and Ethics Committee. All members of the NMB should receive training on the code of conduct during the 3-year term of office.
 - v. The Committee has recommended the appointment of independent chairs for the NEX and the NCF using processes to be agreed by the members of those bodies. The Committee also recommends that applications for the NEX and NCF Chair roles should be open to all.
 - vi. The process for recruiting Independent chairs is likely to take some time. To enable the Board to continue its work, the Committee proposes that the NMB is reconstituted using the twin track structure in ‘shadow mode’, using interim chairs until the formal appointment of independent chairs has been confirmed.
- 18. HC advised that the Committee recommended to NMB/14 that the new governance be provided by the outgoing NMB to the proposed new Boards (NMB Executive Committee and NMB Community Forum) for any adjustments and adoption. Included in the Committee’s proposal was the intent that progressing resolution of the governance considerations set out in the letter to NMB Chair, should be the responsibility of a new Board.
- 19. The Review Committee also proposed a transition plan, in effect the continuation of the present NMB and governance, operating in an interim/shadow mode with a time limitation of the scheduled October NMB. The objective of the October backstop being to both provide time for the selection and recruitment of Chairs for the NEX and NCF, as well as setting a reasonable expectation of the target date for newly appointed chairs to take up their roles and consequently enabling the new NMB to be constituted.
- 20. HC concluded her overview by informing NMB that the Committee has now completed its assigned tasks of consulting on and conducting a detailed review of the NMB, providing a

report and recommendations, together with the follow-on tasks of developing, consulting on and providing recommended governance for the constitution of the new NMB.

- a. HC urged GAL to proceed with due haste in completing the administrative tasks needed to ensure the timely appointment of chairs for the proposed NMB Executive and NMB Community Forum
- b. The Committee Chair went on to record her thanks to fellow Committee members for their time and contributions to their work, at the same time, wishing the NMB every success in achieving a revised constitution and a collaborative noise management environment for all stakeholders.
- c. MP recorded on behalf of NMB, thanks to all Committee Members, including CNG and Industry professionals for the effort involved in progressing this valuable work, which in his view enables the NMB to complete its first term on the right note. Lastly, MP also thanked the NMB Chairman for steering the NMB through its first three years of work.
- d. SP reported that CAGNE did not support the CNG participation on the Review Committee, nor the proposal that AF (or the NMB Secretary) participate in the analysis of NMB Communications.
- e. IH asked whether the recommendations of the Committee are genuinely an opportunity to take community dialogue forward. HC responded that the Committee has considered all views and emphasised once again that for the Committee to reach its conclusions, that compromise had been necessary on all sides. She acknowledged that more work will be needed, but also that the Committee did not want to unnecessarily shackle either the new boards or their respective chairs.
- f. CL acknowledged that there is a lot in the Committee's work that will in his view help the NMB to be more effective, but the same could not be said about its proposals for the core purpose or mission of the NMB. He argued that the current NMB's record is largely one of disappointment and failure because and that the Committee's proposals would lead to more of the same because they do not address the inadequacies of the Board's current Terms of Reference. He pointed out that (in his view) there are no incentives for success and no consequences for failure and that the Board had allowed GAL's growth aspirations to take precedence at all times. He said that it was for those reasons that the CNG had argued that there needed to be a change from an inputs-based approach to a targets-based approach, and argued that the Committee had failed to get to grips with the critical changes that would allow the NMB to be more effective. CL said that CNG could not support the NMB on that basis. SP said that the CL summary of CNG position does not represent CAGNE views.
- g. HC responded that the Committee had considered and discussed extensively the various elements of the CNG proposals, and has incorporated a number of CNG ideas, but was not able to reach agreement to support a target setting role for the NMB.
- h. The NMB Chair indicated his opposition to the suggestion that the NMB should set noise targets, indicating that this is clearly the role of government. He confirmed his full support for the updated NMB Vision and Mission agreed by the Committee:
 - i. NMB Vision. To reduce and mitigate Gatwick aircraft noise in a fair and proportionate manner, by balancing the interests of those communities negatively impacted by aircraft noise, and those of Gatwick Airport.

- ii. NMB Mission. To seek to ensure that the airport, and its wider industry partners, identify and effectively implement all safe, reasonable and practical measures to reduce aircraft noise impacts, and to put in place processes for engaging and dealing with the concerns raised by people that are and could be negatively impacted by Gatwick aircraft noise.
- i. Both IF and MW raised the question of the Committee's proposal for CNG representation on the NMB Executive Committee (NEX), observing that CNG would have a diminished involvement compared to the outgoing NMB.
- j. HC responded that in fact CNG and wider community involvement would now be greater, because of the establishment of the NMB Community Forum (NCF) which is intended to address the NMB's current democratic deficit, as well as the imbalance of NMB Community representation that has been subject of so much feedback and debate in the Review process.
- k. MW suggested that if the NCF chair were a CNG member rather than as proposed by the Committee, an independent representative, this could solve CNG concerns. SP opposed this suggestion based on CAGNE opinion of CNG ability to deal fairly with a balance of views.
- l. IH asked how the Chairs will be selected and appointed. TN reported that GAL intends to use an open process, similar to that recently deployed to appoint the Chair of GATCOM. TN explained that criteria for the leadership roles of both NEX and NCF will be developed and a selection process used to identify and appoint the candidates that best meet these criteria. He expects that the NCF Chair should be a Champion for all Communities. MP indicated that in his view, democracy is the answer, it is important to resolve the democratic deficit of the NMB and to fairly represent all views.
- m. The NMB Chair observed that a timeline will be needed, he supported the October proposal made by the Committee. SP remarked that the GATCOM Chair selection was made behind closed doors. TN underlined the legal need to respect candidate confidentiality, but nevertheless offered on behalf of GAL to share the proposed Job Description with NMB. He also advised that he expected the selection panel, although still to be agreed, to include at a minimum a representative from; Community, GAL, GAL HR, and Industry.
- n. TC, thanked the Review Committee for dealing with the complex issues and urged the NMB to move forward rapidly, while remaining sensitive to all wide range of views evident from both the review and the discussions at this meeting.
- o. RSi also encouraged the NMB to move forward and to continue to work together for the good of all involved. He proposed that the papers from the Review Committee as tabled (NMB/14 WP04) should be approved.
- p. MW made a counter proposition that the constitution of the NEX agreed by the Review Committee be re-opened, to permit a larger participation by CNG, such that there would then be 2 CNG, 2 elected Council Members and the NCF Chair as an extra member. Or in the case where the NCF Chair was selected from either a Council or CNG, the additional position should not be needed
- q. IG questioned how this could ensure balance on the NEX. RC asked whether NCF Chair could be on NEX if not a Council or CNG member, indicating that the Chair of the NCF should be responsible for representing a balanced Community viewpoint at the NEX.

UNCONFIRMED

- r. After some further discussion, before progressing transition to the NMB governance proposed by the Committee, NMB agreed to vote on the CNG amendment proposal tabled by MW; to alter the constitution of the NEX proposed by the Review Committee (NMB/14 WP04), to increase the CNG membership of NEX as outlined in para 20.o. The Tabled Amendment was not agreed, details of the vote are provided at *Figure 1* Below.

Figure 1

Opposed	In Favour
Airlines	CNG Pair #1
ANS (Airport ATM Provider)	CNG Pair #2
Civil Aviation Authority	CNG Pair #3
Department for Transport	CNG Pair #4
GAL	
GATCOM	
NATS (En-Route ATM provider)	
County Council Pair#1	
County Council Pair#2	
NMB Chair	
Total: 10 Votes (72%)	Total: 4 votes (28%)

- s. NMB then considered whether to agree that the governance and related caveats proposed by the NMB Review Committee on May 1st 2019 and submitted to NMB/14 (WP04), should be recommended to a new board. Secondly, as regards the transition phase, that until the new NEX and NCF chairs have been appointed, the existing NMB and governance should continue to operate in shadow mode until not later than the meeting of NMB scheduled for October 16th 2019.

- t. The existing approved NMB governance provides for decision making in the event that it is not possible to reach NMB consensus on any matter. If after exhausting all reasonable efforts, a majority decision can be made provided that it represents at least 75% of the NMB Membership. The NMB was not able to reach an agreement on the adoption of the Committee’s recommendations, using these mechanisms, see *Figure 2* below.

Figure 2

Opposed	In Favour
CNG Pair #1	Airlines
CNG Pair #2	ANS (Airport ATM Provider)
CNG Pair #3	Civil Aviation Authority
CNG Pair #4	Department for Transport
	GAL
	GATCOM
	NATS (en-Route ATM provider)
	County Council Pair#1
	County Council Pair#2
	NMB Chair
Total: 4 votes (28%)	Total: 10 Votes (72%)

21. The Chairman had previously indicated that for the NMB to transition into its second term, that it would be necessary to accept the recommendations developed by the Review Committee (NMB/14 WP04 Attachment 1) on behalf of the NMB over a period of 8 months. Without agreement on its constitution, the Chair confirmed that the NMB will in effect cease to exist.
22. CL suggested that a constructive way to resolve the issue through direct discussions between key stakeholders, CNG and GAL, as he had proposed several times. He also pointed out that many of the detailed amendments to the Committee’s draft Terms of reference proposed by the CNGs had not been adopted and no explanation for their omission had been provided.
23. HC rejected the suggestion that the Committee had not taken all views into account and again made the point that the Committee’s recommendations reflected the compromises necessary to reach agreement for all NMB Members. The CNG representative had participated in these discussions and the development of conclusions.
24. AS observed that the destructive behaviours evident in the discussion could not contribute to reducing aircraft noise, reflecting that excellent progress has already been made by the NMB and that constructive steps were underway and are addressing the very issues that CNG are keen to advance, including the balance of growth and noise.
25. PD said that in his view, no-one wants the NMB to end, and called for the continuation of the Board.
26. The Chair thanked Members for their views noting that the direction of the NMB is a matter for all NMB members, accordingly, following such a lengthy review which has already included comprehensive CNG feedback, that to reject the negotiated output of the Committee, by reintroducing at this last minute stage the CNG objectives that have already been fully considered and taken into account, was unacceptable. He noted that all other NMB Members, including the County Councillors (CC) elected to represent the views of all

constituents, had accepted the Committee's recommendations. CL replied that the CC had not brought any items forward, nor had responded to feedback requests (the Committee worked on the basis that all feedback was confidential and non-attributable). Both HC and RSi rejected CL's claims.

27. TN proposed that the NMB continue as recommended by the Committee, GAL would undertake to provide updates on the process to be used for identifying and selecting the new Chairs.
28. CL reiterated his offer to agree to move forward through bi-lateral discussion between GAL and CNG on noise target setting, membership of the NEX and a further review of the CNG proposals to the Review Committee for NMB terms of reference.. The NMB Chair concluded that the NMB had failed to reach agreement of how to proceed, noting that the NMB would accordingly close.
29. The Chair then offered an alternative, by inviting the CNG Members to withdraw their objection to the proposals agreed by all other members, or whether in fact they actually prefer to see the NMB shut down. CL said that on behalf of CNG he would not withdraw, none of the CNG still present challenged the position taken by CL.
30. The Chairman then brought the discussion to a close, advising that he will inform GAL of the outcome, and that it will now be for GAL to determine whether to re-convene the NMB in future for a second term.

Agenda item 5. Any other Business

31. There were no additional items of NMB business. The Chairman thanked all members for their patience and contributions to NMB and closed the meeting at 17:45.

Schedule of NMB Meetings

No further NMB Meeting dates or workshops have been confirmed.

Attendance List NMB/14**Member Representative**

Air Navigation Solutions	Sally Franks	(SF)
Airline Operators Committee	Douglas Moule	(DM)
Civil Aviation Authority	Mark Simmons	(MS)
Department for Dept Transport	Ian Greene	(IG)
Gatwick Airport Limited	Andy Sinclair	(AS)
NATS	Robin Clarke	(RC)
GATCOM	Tom Crowley	(TC)
East Sussex County Council	Rupert Simmons	(RSi)
Kent County Council	Michael Payne	(MP)
Surrey County Council	Helyn Clack	(HC)
West Sussex County Council	Liz Kitchen	(LK)

Community Noise Group Pairs**Member/Alternate**

HWCAAG/APCAG	Richard Streatfield/Ian Hare	(RS/IH)
Plane Wrong/CAGNE	Mike Ward/ Sally Pavey	(MW/SP)
ESSCAN/TWAANG	Dominic Nevill/Irene Fairbairn	(DN/IF)
PAGNE/GON	Atholl Forbes/Martin Barraud	(AF/MBa)

CNG Coordinator

Charles Lloyd (CL)

Noise Management Board

Chairman	Bo Redeborn	(BR)
Secretary	Graham Lake	(GL)
NMB Assistant (GAL)	Vicki Hughes	(VH)

Observers and Presenters

ANS	Paul Diestelkamp	(PD)
ERM	Steve Mitchell	(SM)
Gatwick Airport Limited	Tim Norwood	(TN)
Gatwick Airport Limited	Kimberley Heather	(KH)
Helios	Katie Mathias	(KM)
Helios	Nick McFarlane	(NM)
ICCAN	Rob Light	(RL)
ICCAN	Sam Hartley	(SHa)
ICCAN	Simon Henley	(SH)
Plane Justice	Chris Quinlan	(CQ)
To70	Ruud Ummels	(RU)

Apologies

NATS	Ian Jopson	(IJ)
------	------------	------

Summary of Actions

<i>NMB/14</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Due</i>	<i>Responsible</i>
<i>ACTION 1</i>	To address the concerns expressed by some CNG Members, that the NMB Chair provide a covering note to accompany the Report be described as the Chair's report and include as an integral part of the report a letter or note from the NMB Chair making clear when it is published, setting out that it has been provided to NMB, it is not a report approved by NMB. NMB/14 Action 01	<i>Open</i>	<i>NMB Chair</i>
<i>ACTION 2</i>	When RNN tracks have been determined for the trial, they will be provided to NMB using a map of sufficient topographical detail to permit accurate determination of the location of actual routes and the vertical profiles that have been defined for the trial.	<i>Open</i>	<i>GAL</i>
<i>NMB/13 ACTION 3</i>	Helios to convene a meeting with CNG to discuss RNN conditions and responses.	<i>Open</i>	
<i>ACTION 4</i>	nil		
<i>ACTION 5</i>	nil		
<i>NMB/13 ACTION 6</i>	Carry forward from NMB/13 To create a standing NMB Standards and Ethics Committee.	<i>Open</i>	<i>GAL</i>
<i>NMB/13 ACTION 7</i>	GAL to advise NMB when the LHR work impacting Gatwick Route 3 has been completed and if available to provide access to the report	<i>Open</i>	<i>GAL</i>

Annex 1. Meeting Documentation NMB/14

NMB/14	Agenda #	
		WORKING PAPERS
WP01		NMB/14 Proposed Agenda
WP02	1	NMB/13 Draft Minutes for Ratification
WP03	4	NMB Review Committee recommended NMB Governance
WP04	4	Transition to NMB 2 nd Term
		INFORMATION PAPERS
IP01		NMB/14 Meeting Documentation
IP02		Preview of NMB/14
IP03	2	NMB/13 Matters Arising: Action List
IP04		Growth and Noise Assessment - GAL
IP05	3	NMB Ad-Hoc Meeting 13 March Draft NMB Terms of Reference for consultation
IP06		NMB Ad-Hoc Meeting 13 March Presentation Slides
IP07		NMB Review Committee Report and Recommendations (copy of NMB/13 WP03)
IP08	4	NMB Review Committee report to NMB Chairman
IP09	3	Reduced Night Noise – Trial planning update
IP10		NMB Term 1 and Implementation Report
IP11	3	NMB Work Plan 2019/2020
IP12		Aircraft Noise Metric Review Presentation Jan 2019
IP13	3	Report of NMB Workplan Activities proposed by Members
IP14	2	NMB Code of Conduct matters arising NMB/13
IP15	3	Replacement of the GAL Noise and Track Keeping System
IP16	2	PAGNE Response, matters arising NMB/13
IP17		GATCOM January 2019 Minutes (unconfirmed)
IP18		GATCOM January 2019 Key Messages
IP19	3	WISG Correspondence – Potential noise benefit undercarriage deployment
IP20	3	RNN Trial Plan
IP21		CAA CAP1748 Noise Impact Survey
IP22		FPT Quarterly report Q4 2018
IP23		Draft Minutes NatMAG February 2019
IP24		NMB Workplan Implementation Steering Group Minutes January 2019
IP25		NMB Workplan Implementation Steering Group Minutes February 2019
IP26		NMB Workplan Implementation Steering Group Minutes March 2019
IP27		ILS Joining Point Report January 2019
IP28		ILS Joining Point Report March 2019
IP29		Review of NMB/14
IP30		Growth and Noise – Noise Policy Review GAL Jan 2019
IP31		CL proposal Growth and Noise Jan 2019
IP32		GAL response to CL proposal Growth and Noise
		External PAPERS
FL01		
FL02		