



Discussion Paper on Independent Aviation Noise Authority (IANA)

Summary of common ground between HACAN and Heathrow Airport (HAL)

12 December 2016

1. Introduction

The Airports Commission's final report (p 303) recommended the establishment of an Independent Aviation Noise Authority (IANA), "in particular to help address the considerable lack of trust that remains between communities close to the UK's airports and the airports themselves." We understand that an alternative name under consideration is Independent Commission on Aviation Noise (ICAN).

The two organisations, HACAN and HAL, support the concept of IANA, recognising that noise exposed communities would value an independent assessment of whether aircraft noise is being managed as effectively and fairly as possible.

This paper presents some points of common agreement by the two stakeholder organisations. It covers the potential principles, roles and operation of an IANA. The final section identifies some pitfalls that we agree need to be avoided when establishing an IANA.

Further analyses and discussion are still needed to better define the specific roles where such a body can most add value and integrate with existing institutions.

We believe that this joint position emphasises the strong support of an IANA from both organisations and we would like to take the opportunity to provide constructive input into the DfT consultation to be published early in the New Year.

2. Principles behind an IANA

IANA should be **independent** of government, the aviation industry, local authorities, NGOs and community organisations. **Credibility** among noise affected communities and the industry as well as political **neutrality** are key.

IANA should have functions which airlines, airports, community organisations, local authorities, the CAA and Government all feel aid them in their work. It needs to be effective in **building trust** and **mutual understanding** between airports (and airlines, air navigation service providers and other industry stakeholders) and their noise affected communities.

IANA should recognise Government policies on aircraft noise, including the application of the ICAO **balanced approach** to aircraft noise management. It should also be cognisant of operational and environmental trade-offs such as safety, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

It should be a **permanent** body rather than one focussed on a single project or issue.



On the issue of **geographic scope**, Heathrow recognises that other UK airports do not see the value of an IANA as a national body. As Heathrow does not own any other UK airports, we have not taken a view on the merits or otherwise of a national body. Heathrow believes that an IANA could initially start as a body focused on Heathrow, with a review after two years to evaluate progress and the case for expanding this to cover the whole of the UK. The members of HACAN feel strongly that the Government should take forward a national IANA from the outset.

In order to maintain its independence and that it is seen as independent, the IANA should be a body separate to both the CAA and the DfT.

3. Roles of an IANA

3.1 Key Roles

The main role of the IANA should be to provide an **impartial source of expert advice**. We believe it should start with a small number of key roles as listed in this section. As the IANA evolves and matures and stakeholders feel comfortable with its role, it could take on additional tasks discussed in the next section.

Best Practice and Research

- Establish a framework for noise management which is rooted in best practice, encouraging airports and Air Navigation Safety Providers (ANSPs, air traffic control companies) in an advisory capacity to go further where they fall short;
- Provide an independent view of the latest international and national research in relation to aviation noise impacts;
- Review consultation engagement strategy and materials, including if local communities are being given sufficient and clear information about noise and where airports are managing issues well;
- Identify the need for and make recommendations on independent research such as noise effects on health;
- Provide advice to Government.

Ombudsman or Assurance Role

- An ombudsman-type role to investigate complaints that have not been resolved locally, how they were handled and to make recommendations toward bringing about resolutions of the complaints;
- A back-stop role in mediating high-level disputes (with communities);
- Arbitration or mediation between airport and community where requested to do so. (Note that criteria would be needed to define when requests can be made).



3.2 Options for Further Roles

This section provides roles that could be considered once IANA has been set up and has established a track record on the Key Roles described above.

Best Practice and Research

- Be a source of informed and impartial advice with regard to the airspace change consultation content and engagement;
- Assist with the design of noise envelopes where called upon either by the airport, airlines, the ANSP or the local community;
- Be available to provide an independent view on significant planning and airspace change – CAA should then be required to consider this view as part of the airspace change process.

Reviewing Role - Assessing progress and achievements

- High level overview of noise action plans against best practice based on the size and scale of the airport and its impacts;
- Where airports (aerodromes) are not required to produce noise action plans, high level overview of airport noise mitigation plans.

Ombudsman or Assurance Role

- Provide auditing or quality assurance;
- Be available to provide independent monitoring of airport performance against noise commitments such as planning conditions, corporate social responsibility commitments and Noise Action Plans, while taking into consideration both the planning system and the Community Engagement Board;
- Be available to review the processes, systems and effectiveness of forums aimed at improving compliance with noise abatement procedures contained within the UK AIP;
- Be available to support the competent authority responsible for establishing new operating restrictions under EU Regulation 598.

4. Composition and Funding

IANA should be a small, flexible body – harnessing different skills from complimentary backgrounds (industry, community etc.), served by a small secretariat and/or a technical advisory group.

Appointments should be made by the Secretary of State for Transport for fixed periods, such as 3 years, with the possibility of reappointment for an additional 3-year period.



Direct funding must be independent from industry or other interested parties such as from Government or public funds.

5. Pitfalls to be Avoided

IANA should not be a policy-making body; policy should remain with the Government.

It should not have a role as the “noise police”. It should not have enforcement powers nor the ability to fine airlines or airports but Government and other stakeholders would be required to give clear reasons why they chose not to follow its recommendations.

It should not take the lead on major pieces of research or noise surveys, although a project management role could be appropriate.

It should not be an arm or branch of the CAA or DfT.

It should not be a ‘crisis-management’ body.

6. Further Comments

The Aircraft Noise Ombudsman (ANO) in Australia has reported some success in assisting certain problematic and long standing noise complaints and bringing them to a resolution. The Terms of Reference of the ANO is a public document (see www.ano.gov.au) and some of its ideas have been incorporated in the ideas above.

By contrast the French ACNUSA is viewed by some as being cumbersome and ineffective, often driven by the need to impose fines in order to fund itself.

7. Closing

HACAN and HAL have collaborated on developing these comments in order to progress the development of an IANA. We hope that they are constructive and helpful. We would be happy to continue the dialogue and engage either as a group or individually.