

EDINBURGH AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY BOARD

Note of Record - Thirty Eighth Meeting held on Wednesday 7th October 2020

By Webex

Commencing at 6.30pm

Present: Lindsay Cole, (LC); (Chair)

Merv Archibald (MA), Blackness Area CC; Adam Cumming (AC) Cramond Association); Bruce Finlayson (BF), North Queensferry CC; Ray Flint (RF) Kinghorn CC; Vic Garrad (VC) Kirknewton CC; Ray Godfree (RG), Ratho & District CC; Bernie McIntosh (BMc), in lieu of Louise Gunstensen (LG), Dalgety Bay & Hillend CC; Tom Leatherland (TL), Limekilns and Charleston CC; Neil Lovett (NL) East Calder CC; Helena Paul (HP), Blackness Area CC/EAW; Pippa Plevin (PP), Joint Forum of Community Councils in West Lothian; Liz Scobie (LS), Uphall CC; Karen Walker (KW) Blackness Area CC; Andrew Watt (AW), Dalkeith & District CC & Midlothian Federation CC; Tom Wylie (TW) Cramond and Barnton CC.

In attendance: Simon Rhodes (SR) EAL; June McClung (JMcC) EAL

Apologies: None

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting together with -
June McClung and Simon Rhodes from Edinburgh Airport Limited (EAL)

Matters Arising from Meeting held on Wednesday 2nd September 2020

ITEM		ACTION
1	<p>Approval of Previous Minutes</p> <p>A draft record of the meeting held on 2nd September had been circulated to all members prior to this meeting and in the absence of any comments were proposed (MA) and seconded (AC) as a true record of the meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that the draft minutes of the “virtual” meeting held on 1st July 2020 remain to be approved and remain in abeyance until comments raised by a member could be clarified and agreed by the Members. It was determined that these comments would be accommodated so that a final draft may be approved by members.</p> <p>In relation to previous questions relating to the re-introduction of funding by EAL for a minute secretary, the Chair confirmed that Chair has had several conversations with GR but in light of redundancies, EAL is not prepared to fund a minutes secretary at the moment. However this could be reconsidered perhaps at the end of 2020 or beginning of 2021. It was noted that the amount requested is a modest amount and there are possibly other options that could be discussed under AOB.</p>	BF/RG

<p>2</p>	<p>Matters Arising from previous meetings</p> <p>As previously noted several items are listed as in abeyance pending a resumption of normal meetings and attendance by EAL once COVID-19 restrictions are eased. These items remain included as an appendix to this record.</p> <p>Noted that members are requested to review the Appendix with a view to closing items that are completed or no longer relevant at the next meeting</p> <p>0-----0</p>	<p>ALL</p>
<p>2.1</p>	<p>34.4.1.2</p> <p>A query was raised to EAL as to whether Sandy Legget remained on furlough to which EANAB were asked to forward a request for contact details. Contact with GR reply outline to get in touch with SL or Simon Rhodes. Noted this ongoing for nearly a year Noted Simon Rhodes of EAL returned from furlough on 31st August and as “Head of Airspace “will be contacting EANAB soon. Contact has been established.</p>	<p>AW EAL CLOSED</p>
<p>2.2</p>	<p>Another consultation feedback closed last week. Thanks noted from MA over consultations Note further discussion on Fasi N & Fasi S Procedures for re-classifying airspace consultation just starting to Sept Ongoing Covered under Item 4 below</p>	<p>ALL/AW CLOSED</p>
<p>2.3</p>	<p>35.5 Article in The Ferret online publication</p> <p>35.5.1</p> <p>Contact RL to establish potential guidelines and ICCAN input. Contact established</p>	<p>HP CLOSED</p>
<p>2.4</p>	<p>It was noted the chair had been contacted by Rupert Bashan of ICCAN and a meeting via Zoom is to be held with Lindsay and Rupert Bashan during the week commencing 21st September. It was asked could the ICCAN subgroup be included, and would the Chair copy the email received from Rupert Bashan.to the ICCAN Subgroup.</p> <p>The meeting was held on the 25th September took place during which the CHAIR provided with an update on his view of how the review is going.</p> <p>It was asked that the EANAB ICCAN sub-group be involved with future meetings to which the Chair stated this meeting was only to do with the review and when a meeting does require the sub-group, they will be involved.</p>	<p>CHAIR CLOSED</p>
<p>2.5</p>	<p>35.5.2</p> <p>It was agreed the Chair will contact Gordon Robertson tomorrow to clarify what he means in his press quotes. Noted a response from EAL is awaited. Further contact has been made with GR (EAL) and a written note of a response is awaited</p> <p><u>35.6 Updates from Sub Groups</u></p>	<p>CHAIR/EAL</p>

2.6	<p>35.6.4 Health</p> <p>35.6.4.1 As noted previously under matters arising a report has been circulated. NHS has offered to provide some data, not yet received and options are being considered.</p> <p>It was noted that KW has volunteered to join the health sub-group as a very welcome addition with access to potential contacts.</p> <p>AC has had a discussion with a member of the Royal College of Physicians who, since no progress has been made through NHS Lothian has an occupational physician in mind who might be interested in helping with clinical support.</p> <p>The Sub-group has taken on board the impact of night flights and will contact Christine Jardine MP in the relation to this.</p> <p>It was noted that this item may be closed as ongoing reports will be covered under sub-group reports in the normal agenda</p>	AC/ONGOING CLOSED
2.7	<p>35.6.4.2 It was noted that litigation has been listed (internet) against airports in the USA with regard to Performance Based Navigation (PBN) that often causes issues worldwide.</p> <p>Link to relevant web site to be provided for EANAB members Link still to be provided. Noted Links regarding litigation against airports in the USA distributed to members</p> <p>There appear to be many others that could be looked at also with similarities to the situation regarding the first ACP without proper consultation (such as the TUTUR trial). It was questioned with respect to concentrated noise effects on health, whether EANAB should consider this when the study is carried out, and generally agreed by several it was a good and pertinent point to ensure that this is raised and is flagged and considered by approaching the Royal College of Physicians and NHS Scotland. Noted covered under item 2.6 above for inclusion under sub-group reports</p>	AC CLOSED
2.8	<p>35.7.3 It was noted a short letter has been drafted based on that which ICCAN produced regarding opportunities to reduce and mitigate noise while the aviation industry is reopening for forwarding to EAL and copy to ICCAN.</p> <p>Noted a letter was posted – date to be confirmed. No response as yet – letter passed on to others via Hannah Bardell MP.</p> <p>Noted no responses but this may be due to people at EAL and CAA still being on furlough. Note a further request for response to be made</p>	CHAIR
2.9	<p>37.3 Update on KML Noise Maps</p> <p>An on-line meeting was held on 29th July with GR and AL of EAL Subsequently MA met JMcC on 11th August The main points are how could the board use these maps better to inform our communities (e.g. Ratho Station residential Development). Edinburgh Airport expressed concern in releasing KML data in case of misunderstanding amongst the public lay people and because they are deemed commercially sensitive, which was difficult to understand.</p> <p>However this has been discussed further and EAL will now release the KML data via Dropbox. Data has been received.</p>	JMcC/EAL CLOSED
2.10		

2.11	<p>In noting that landings are often louder than take offs, an aspect largely overlooked in recent noise studies by developers, it was suggested that it might be worth contacting councillors who are involved with the planning committee in order to better inform or educate them with regard to aviation noise and EAL suggested that EANAB might offer to attend relevant council meetings to better inform the Council on noise issues. Noted that this had been discussed with Councillor Kevin Lang and was determined as a matter to be covered by the Review Panel under a wider remit considering contact with communities.</p>	CHAIR CLOSED
2.12	<p>37.6.2 Code of Conduct A proposed amendment to the Code of Conduct was circulated to all members on prior to the meeting on 31st August incorporating a proposed additional clause “D12” to the CoC providing guidance to the Chair and all Members in relation to statements made to the Press and other external organisations on behalf of EANAB.</p> <p>During discussion it was questioned whether the proposed clause should be expanded to say that any formal statements are only issued with approval of the Board.</p> <p>During subsequent discussion it was noted that gaining Board agreement/approval would take significant time and limit the Boards ability to respond to Press Questions as immediate responses would necessarily be limited to “No Comment”. It was observed that this could be misconstrued by readers. However it was further proposed that there should be a backstop of board approval in order to protect the spokesperson.</p> <p>The meeting failed to agree to the Chair’s proposal that there be a vote on the amendment, and it was suggested that more text be added and that since there does not seem to be an urgent rush for the amendment that approval could wait until the next board meeting. Noted that the Governance Sub group has not met since the last meeting and this and the other issues raised under item 6 may be put in abeyance for now so that the review panel can look at the issues and make their recommendations. This approach was agreed by the meeting</p>	GSG/CHAIR CLOSED
2.13	<p>37.6.3.1 Determination of the EANAB annual calendar: A proposed amendment to the Code of Conduct was circulated to all members on prior to the meeting on 31st August incorporating a proposed additional clause “D12” to the CoC providing guidance to the Chair and all Members in relation to statements made to the Press and other external organisations on behalf of EANAB. See action under item 2.11 above</p> <p>During discussion it was questioned whether the proposed clause should be expanded to say that any formal statements are only issued with approval of the Board.</p> <p>During subsequent discussion it was noted that gaining Board agreement/approval would take significant time and limit the Boards ability to respond to Press Questions as immediate responses would</p>	GSG CLOSED

2.14	<p>necessarily be limited “No Comment”. It was observed that this could be misconstrued by readers. However it was further proposed that there should be a backstop of board approval in order to protect the spokesperson.</p> <p>The meeting failed to agree to the Chair’s proposal that there be a vote on the amendment, and it was suggested that more text be added and that since there does not seem to be an urgent rush for the amendment that approval could wait until the next board meeting See action under item 2.11 above</p>	GSG CLOSED
2.15	<p>6.3.3 Representation</p> <p>In respect of Blackness Community Council it was noted that one member (HP) is said to represent both Blackness Community Council and Edinburgh Airport Watch (EAW). Since this representation has not previously been recorded clarification was requested as to the status of EAW and how it functions in terms of members, meetings, officers and who it represents?</p> <p>During subsequent discussion no such clarification was provided and the matter was left in abeyance for Blackness Community Council to consider how to address this 3-fold representation. See action under item 2,11 above</p>	CHAIR CLOSED
2.16	<p>It was noted further that the validity of representation of Edinburgh Airport Watch on the Board remains to be addressed. See action under item 2,11 above</p>	CHAIR CLOSED
2.17	<p>It was noted that the listing of represented organisations shown on the EANAB Website is outdated and should be brought up to date. Noted the list has been updated</p>	RG/PP CLOSED
2.18	<p>Up-dates from Sub Groups</p> <p>37.7.2 Outer movements - It is hoped that EANAB can now get the priority needed via EAL’s new team members, Simon Rhodes.</p>	AW CLOSED
2.19	<p>Review of Issues Log</p> <p>37.7.4 It was noted that update information from two or three people had been received and the log has been updated with the modest changes. Noise reports for the first two quarters of 2020 are to be circulated to all Members and an updated issues log is to be issued in due course. Noted ongoing pending issue of the Q3 report.</p>	TL ONGOING
	<p>AOB</p> <p>It was noted that a planned review with EAL of noise reports should be postponed as there is so little data in Q1 and Q2. See item 2.23 above</p>	TL CLOSED

<p>3</p>	<p>Noise Board Review Up-date</p> <p>The Chair reported that the review panel has decided to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bring on at least one extra person onto the panel whilst confirming that EANAB members BF and PP have been invited to join the panel 2. Assign Gordon Robertson (GR) as a representative of EAL 3. Rename the review task force to - the “Review Panel” <p>It was noted that the review was first aired in April/May with the board were notified in June, and it is hoped that the panel can conclude the review by early 2021 although no timelines are set.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Consultation responses.</p> <p>The All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry Group (APPG) response has been circulated to all previously. It was noted the questions were quite general.</p> <p>Consultation from the CAA about reclassifying the airspace was thought not to concern us but a comment was submitted. The reclassification process is a three-stage process, the first of which is a “Consider” stage – an internal meeting within CAA, somewhat similar to the ACP but with a rather vague process without a proper pathway.</p> <p>SR did indicate that this process seems heavy-handed and noted that the CAA has advertised for someone to run the reclassification process. It was noted It is probably not relevant to Edinburgh due to the number of passengers which will mean that the Edinburgh air space cannot fall into this procedure.</p> <p>Response to the consultation to be forwarded by AW</p>	<p>AW</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Aviation Subgroup meeting with Simon Rhodes (SR)</p> <p>It was confirmed a long-awaited meeting had been held on 22nd September 2020 and a note of the meeting had been circulated to members on 29th September. It was noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was helpful to get SR up to speed with discussions from last year. - Two areas featured: arrivals pathways and wider proposal of using the Forth Estuary and North Sea - SR has offered to involve the group with the ACP. - The military air space map from AC was obtained through a MOD desk officer who is now a useful contact. - It has been confirmed that there is no MOD space in the Forth Estuary. - It is important to keep in contact with the MOD and also look at the height limits involved with restricted space as it might be possible for planes to fly over MOD space e.g. The Otterburn firing range. - New spaces that affect EANAB might be in further away inbound or outbound areas, not just the immediate area of under 7000 feet around the airport. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some MOD and NATO exercises are time-limited so could be worked around if the details can be joined up and allow flexibility. - It is important to fully understand everything so that flexibility might be achieved. - With reference to the last ACP, the GOSSAM route was limited and EAL said it was because of military airspace which was not correct and therefore it is encouraging that clarity is now being achieved moving forward. <p>It was noted that a full understanding of MOD airspace was imperative for EANAB to allow meaningful determination of available airspace.</p> <p>SR reiterated that under CAP 1616 EANAB we have to establish what is the baseline and what can be done or changed. It was noted that Stage 7 (established Feb 2020) involves many parameters, e.g. In a scenario where one of 2 SIDS is not much used, but it is then intended to be brought into use then procedures are required.</p> <p>Members were reminded of the change of use of flight paths in the Edinburgh area in 2015 which increased noise levels for many communities.</p>	
<p>6</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p>	<p>Updates from Sub-group</p> <p>Aviation Several meetings have been held recently and minutes are to be issued in due course.</p> <p>The Group met with To70 on 25th September to discuss a possible proposal of To70 independently looking at noise profiles to mediate noise. Awaiting feedback (expected soon).</p> <p>There was a second meeting with an independent consultant from Manchester University on 28th September however after consideration this is unlikely to be an avenue to proceed with further.</p> <p>The sub-group asks if anyone on the board has a suggestion of other options for independent consultants. AC to pursue two potential contacts.</p> <p>Meeting on 29th September with SR and JMcC who are to action items from 25th August meeting. There was a lot covered including a paper from JM regarding NAP and ACP. The timescale for the NAP is several years and somewhat involved. Both NAP and ACP require a period of consultation but it is probably not ideal to do these simultaneously and so they should be managed one after another instead. It was noted that the EAL NAP is due in 2023.</p> <p>The full Aviation Sub-Group met on 6th October to consider GR's suggestions of 1st October to modify the brief for to T070, which is yet to be circulated to the Aviation Group and Board.</p> <p>Outer air space – all discussed under item 5</p>	<p>MA</p> <p>MA</p> <p>MA/ALL/AC</p> <p>MA</p>

<p>6.4</p> <p>6.4.1</p> <p>6.5</p>	<p>Governance – there has been little activity as noted under section above discussed earlier matters to be held in abeyance until the Review Panel confirms recommendations following its review of overall aspects for the Board to subsequently discuss and accept.</p> <p>Other Groups</p> <p>ICCAN Group – there has been some activity including correspondence from Sam Hartley (1st October). There are some FASI changes that impact EDI and it might possibly be appropriate to contact ACOG. SR explains there is an airspace change in the south of England and the north one needs to be tied in with it. We still use the FASI North and South terminology and the focus was very much on the south-east corner which makes it harder for us in the north - we now have to try to slot in. SR has a good relationship with ACOG and EAL is part of their meetings.</p> <p>CCs have suggestions but how do they get them heard by those in NATS so that they can have the feedback from people on the ground. The presentations from one year ago by RF and AW have been presented to SR who will speak to his contact at ACOG to see how best to present this information to them and possibly find a contact for the board to speak with however it is possible that ACOG may request that the information be presented as part of the ACP. For any of the suggestions that are out with the ACP, a contact would be helpful at ACOG or otherwise perhaps we could approach Ian Jepson. SR will show EANAB what is required on stage two for the ACP and will give us the opportunity to input on the options.</p> <p>Query if anyone heard about the ACP survey done in March 2020 however there was no recollection from any members and it is suggested that we all sign up for the ICCAN newsletter. Noted that emails would be checked for relevant information.</p> <p>Health, group will look at the ICCAN report</p> <p>ACP, the CAA have paused the ACP at stage 1B because of Covid-19, SR is trying to un-pause it. Various authorities are now gearing back up however some staff (e.g. NATS) are still on furlough. EAL may try to do some of the stage 2 towards the end of 2020 or early 2021. Original final date of summer 2023 has now been revised to summer 2024. SR is reviewing the statement of need and resubmitting by the end of this year – it is being reviewed regarding capacity and the aim is to make it fit for purpose in 10 years from now. There is also a requirement to provide evidence to your stakeholders that EAL is being sensible.</p> <p>ICCAN say they have no formal role in the review process but are in contact with LC and Robert Carr. It would be helpful to have some feedback on these conversations to join things up.</p> <p>Issues log</p>	<p>AC</p>
------------------------------------	--	------------------

	<p>The up-dated Issues Log was issued on the 7th October. It was noted that although there has been an attempt to remove some of the text the Log is becoming very bulky.</p> <p>If as previously agreed the annual calendar is to start in January, Issue Champions will need to set up their plan for 2021 as much as possible by the year end so as to allow mapping out the workload. It was noted that it would be good to use this as a more proactive document whilst recognising that it can take a long time to pull information together but it was suggested that groups meet to plan next year and review regularly.</p> <p>It was suggested the update column be limited to current status with previous updates removed to an archive.</p> <p>It was noted some tasks are harder to assign a timescale to and perhaps these could be assigned with stepwise stages or sequence and track as they are achieved however, target dates might be worth trying and groups try to at least provide best guesses and then review this in 3 to 6 months time. Agreed that the document is very valuable.</p>	<p>RG/ Issue Champions</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>Minute secretary – It is recognised that providing the meeting minutes puts pressure on RG and KW and it was suggested that boards members go back to their respective Community Organisations to ask for contributions as a temporary measure for example, six months</p> <p>An estimated contribution of £50 per community council would provide around £500 which could perhaps support circa five meetings with funds held by the treasurer of one of the represented Community groups since the board does not have a bank account.</p> <p>It was agreed to check with GR for an indication on how long we may need to fund ourselves, whilst all were requested to approach their Organisations and feedback either by email to RG or at the next meeting.</p> <p>Planning Matters</p> <p>It was noted that there is evidence of two significant residential developments to the west of airport that may be impacted by aviation noise, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● up to 2,000 dwellings near Pumpherston, virtually underneath the flight path, and: ● 600 dwellings as a proposed extension of the Calderwood development at East Calder across the City Boundary into Edinburgh, offset by about one mile from the flight path. <p>Maps are to be forwarded to JMcC to allow accurate overlays of noise contours which she will be able to do on her return from annual leave on 26th October.</p>	<p>CHAIR ALL/RG</p> <p>MA, RG/JMcC</p>

EDINBURGH AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY BOARD
APPENDIX TO MINUTES OF MEETING 35 – 1st July 2020
Matters arising from previous meetings to 6th May 2020

ITEM		ACTION
2.1	<p>Matters Arising from previous meetings</p> <p>21.4.4 EAL agreed to involve the Aviation Consultancy Sub-Group in discussions with ERDC relating to noise modelling. It was noted that no further progress had been made and that any response received from ERDC would be shared with the sub-group. EAL confirmed that they had escalated this matter as still no progress had been made due to absence of Darren Rhodes. Another prompt will be made next week EANAB will continue to invite dialogue with the groups. This crucial piece of work has been commissioned by EAL but no progress has been made. EAL worked with the sub-group to agree the criteria for the noise modelling, which EAL then commissioned ERCD to carry out; that work is currently ongoing. EANAB are also seeking to speak directly with ERCD but as yet have had no response.</p> <p>To be covered under Noise Map Updates.</p> <p>Maps received. Ongoing action for all to look at maps</p>	<p>Ongoing All</p>
2.2	<p>Updates from Sub-Groups:</p> <p>28.3.3 It was reported that the EACC minutes dated 16 August stated that the Runway 6 trial had been successful and allowed 1-minute separation without additional flight path. EAL agreed to look into this and report back to the Board with details of the trial and its outcomes. After discussion it was concluded that the minute was not for 16 August, but from the meeting that took place in August 2016. The response from LMcl (EAL) confirms the August 2016 minutes reference Andrew Mather “talking about an increase in 06 departures and the airport advising that no changes had been made to the flight paths, but the frequency of departures had increased. A trial was carried out in early 2016, however, NATS were unable to collect sufficient data and a report with outcomes was not produced.” It was discussed why the trial may not have been repeated and why the trial was reported as successful. It was suggested that perhaps it did not transfer from NATS to ANS. JM to investigate what happened and request it to be repeated. There remains an option to put the question to the EACC via the representatives from EANAB) It was clarified that a trial was carried out in 2016, but that not enough data was collected and no report was produced. The statement relating to a successful trial was in relation to an unrelated trial. There is no intention for a repeat trial.</p> <p>It was determined that EANAB should consider a direct approach to NATS in attempt to obtain data relating to the runway 06 trial</p>	

2.3	<p>Health 29.4.4.1 Meeting arranged with NHS for Thursday 23 January 2020. CAA published in October 2019 a 6-month update on CAP1841 aircraft noise and health effects. The meeting took place as arranged. To be discussed later under issues log. Report has been circulated. NHS have offered to provide some data, not yet received. Options being considered.</p>	Ongoing AC
2.4	<p>29.4.5.1 Review of Issues Log Issues Champions are asked to update the history column to make it more relevant and up to date. Sub groups to check issues are captured. It was noted that some updates had been made and circulated within a new issue of the Log "Working Draft 2020 ISSUES LOG Rev A" to be discussed and noted later at this meeting.</p>	RG Ongoing
2.5	<p>Awaiting responses from Issue Champions</p> <p>30.3.1 AW agreed to forward report sent by EANAB to the CAA to RC/EACC. AW had not been aware that this was an action but will send.</p>	Ongoing AW
2.6	<p>There was no separate EACC submission. Email received from RC</p>	
2.7	<p>30.6.3 The Chair noted that the Planning and Noise report was received from RC and suggested this is dealt with by email outside of the meeting. Waiting to hear back. Contact with Janice Howgarth of EACC will continue via email</p>	Ongoing LC
2.8	<p>31.8 AOB 31.8.2 A question was raised as to whether Glasgow has a Noise Board. It was planned for end of 2019. LC to liaise with JH. LC to determine status of a Glasgow Noise Board under present Coronavirus issues.</p>	Ongoing LC
2.9	<p>31.8.6 ACP update. Further to discussion In view of ongoing uncertainty it was determined that EANAB write formally to the CAA requesting clarity relating to the ACP timetable, and, given the perception that the ACP appears biased towards capacity issues and significant projected growth in air traffic to raise awareness of the potential long term downward impact of the present coronavirus. ACP suspended until further notice</p>	CHAIR In abeyance
	<p>The New Situation/The Way Forward</p>	ALL/MA Ongoing

2.10	<p>32.3.1The EANAB – MA offered to collate Member’s comments for uploading to the website to inform Communities of continuing EANAB effort in relation to aviation noise.</p>	
2.11	<p>32.3.2 The impact on the ACP to be clarified by writing formally to the CAA requesting clarity relating to the ACP timetable.(see Item 2.19 above), and, given the perception that the ACP appears biased towards capacity issues and significant projected growth in air traffic to raise awareness of the potential long term downward impact of the present coronavirus. ACP suspended until further notice</p>	<p>CHAIR In abeyance</p>
2.12	<p>32.3.3 Noted that whilst EAL are impacted by the immediate downturn in demand a window of opportunity exists for EANAB to continue activities and to promote its concerns and ideas to both the CAA and ICCAN</p>	<p>Ongoing ALL</p>
2.13	<p>Review of Issues Log</p> <p>32.6 Whilst “New issues” are invited from Members at any time, in the first instance, all members listed against each and every Issue are asked to feedback current update information so that the Log may be completed to reflect the current status quo. Awaiting responses from Issue Champions</p>	<p>ALL/RG Ongoing</p>
2.14	<p>Annual Report</p> <p>32.7.1 It was noted that whilst any immediate pressure to submit the report to EAL was reduced allowing time to perfect the final issue it would be pertinent to complete the report as soon as possible. A draft copy is to be circulated for discussion/comment. Draft issued</p>	<p>Chair Ongoing</p>
2.15	<p>32.7.2 Further to recent events it was agreed that the Governance sub-group review the EANAB Code of Conduct with a view to introducing measures for controlling potential breaches of the Code and a mechanism for addressing complaints. The Governance Group is in the process of refining draft changes to the ToR and CoC for subsequent issue to the Board for approval</p>	<p>RG Ongoing</p>
2.16	<p>32.7.3 It was noted that a document charting the process of determining design principles for the ACP appeared to conclude principles that in some cases ignored basic principles established in consultations. As an example, an intent of “No Change to Flightpaths” appears to be ignored in final conclusions Members were asked to draw attention of the Chair to similar issues so that the CAA might be informed by letter.</p>	<p>Ongoing ALL/CHAIR</p>
2.17	<p>32.7.5 It was noted that feedback/comment is still required relating to an email on Planning Issues circulated previously. The email to be circulated to all members as a reminder.</p>	<p>Ongoing BF/ALL CHAIR</p>
2.18	<p>32.7.7 A draft email to EAL, prepared requesting minimal funding to EANAB to cover costs of a minutes secretary is to be circulated for comment and further action.</p>	
	<p>33.5</p>	<p>ALL/MA</p>

<p>2.19</p>	<p>Updates from EANAB Noting that Christophe Miremont had resigned as a member of EANAB question arose as to how his profiling analysis may be continued. This will need addressing by the full EANAB board.</p> <p>Any Other Business</p> <p>33.6.1 Complaint Procedure It was noted that a complaint had been received from a Board Member and this needed to be addressed through action ongoing from item 2.19 above. Draft procedures prepared for dealing with Complaints and put to both parties of the Complaint as a mechanism for resolution.</p> <p>33.6.2 Health It was noted that a further potential contact had been made and was to be followed up</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0-----0</p>	<p>RG/BF ONGOING</p> <p>AC</p>
--------------------	---	--

