

Aviation Management Board Meeting

RUK, Greencoat House, Francis Street, London SW1P 1DH

Date: Monday 15 October 2012

Present

MJ	Michael Jampel	DECC – Chair
CG	Chris Gormley	DECC
DBe	David Best	DfT
MC	Matthew Clear	The Crown Estate
MB	Mark Balsdon	NATS
MP	Matt Partridge	RUK
PA	Paul Askew	RUK
SH	Simon Heyes	Infinis (AIFCL Chair)
WC	Wayne Cranstone	RWE (AIFCL deputy)
SC	Simon Coote	Scottish Government
DBo	David Boyd	Ministry of Defence
LB	Laura Bushfield	Ministry of Defence
FH	Fabrizio Harley	Ministry of Defence
RS	Rob Siddall	AOA
AK	Andy Knill	CAA

Introduction, Minutes & Actions

1. MJ opened the meeting and introduced himself as the new Chair of the Aviation Management Board and as the new Senior Responsible Officer for the Aviation Programme in DECC.
2. Following a round table, MJ explained the new ORED structure in DECC. Within the new Renewables Delivery Team, CG would be the lead for the Aviation Programme, Jon Hayward is the Aviation Plan Manager and David Jones continues to be seconded to DECC for 1 day a week as a technical advisor.
3. The draft minutes from the 17 July AMB were approved. MJ ran through the outstanding actions. CG suggested that Action 2 should be closed for now as it had been superseded by the Raytheon business case. It may be opened in the future but a recent discussion with Ofgem suggested claw-back should be a regulatory measure of last resort. PA, AK and CG agreed that action 4 should be transferred to CAA and DECC to take forward. Actions 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 & 11 were all completed and closed. A meeting with Met Office was likely to take place in the coming weeks so action 12 was left open.

Aviation Plan

4. Following on from an action taken at the previous AMB, CG presented the new Dashboard which had been pulled together by Jon Hayward in conjunction with PA and MC. It set out the overall strategy and key barriers for the group to address. Key work areas, milestones and risks from the quarter were also highlighted. The format was well received by most and will be used for future AMBs.
5. For future AMBs, AK thought that the Dashboard should remain a high level document and SH made a clear preference to keep ATC mitigation solutions listed separately to maintain a clear sight on progress. MB and PA thought a matrix of Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs) might be appropriate for future dashboards. This might be something which comes out of the Aviation Advisory Panel (AAP).
6. Top current workstreams included the MOD ATC mitigation project, the Raytheon Business case (both of which were later agenda items) and the Evidence Workstream. PA gave a quick update on the Evidence workstream noting that RUK, working with DECC and with a small enabling contribution from the FMB, was going to launch a new objections survey. This would follow the survey completed early in 2012 and would help the AMB make more strategic decisions on where to focus effort.
7. CG suggested that there may be some workstreams due to close (Lighting) and others which may need to be initiated. He wondered if an MOD "Safeguarding" workstream would be useful. DBo agreed that he would consider what this might look like ahead of the next meeting of the AMB.

Action 13: Workstream owners who had not responded thus far to get in contact with Jon with updates.

Action 14: DBo to consider what a safeguarding workstream would look like ahead of the next AMB.

Raytheon – NATS presentation

8. MB gave a presentation to the group on the Raytheon Business Case. The presentation set forward the benefits and the current pricing proposals. MB believed that approximately 55 sites could benefit from the Raytheon modification and could potentially release up to a maximum of 6-8 GW of capacity. The proposed roll-out would initially target 5 radars that will have the greatest impact on releasing capacity. By equipping the 5 initial sites NATS expects to provide mitigation for 90% of projected future windfarm developments.
9. On costs, an initial investment of £10 – £15m and additional spend on annual maintenance costs of circa £0.3m – £0.6m. The charging mechanisms available to developers would be provided through two different options – a variable charge dependent on the capacity of the development with a small

retainer and a fixed charge for those developers wanting to pay an up-front fee which entitles the developer to a specific volume of MW mitigation. MB had discussed these principles with a large number of developers at a high level and they have been well received.

10. MB was keen to underline that the system would operate with some form of “gain/profit share” principle that would kick in when payback has been achieved. The exact mechanism was not yet certain but could involve Developers who have paid a fixed rate receiving a rebate and variable tariffs could be reduced accordingly. A reporting mechanism would be set up to present figures on a regular basis to the initial funders. MB hoped NATS would be able to publish details of the roll-out by end of Feb 2013 with practical modifications happening in the summer months.
11. SC strongly supported the proposal and thanked MB for the significant progress that had been made. The feeling was that this could be a watershed moment that could potentially accelerate development. SH and WC noted that the FMB were delighted with progress and supportive of the approach. SH asked about the number of initial modifications and which one would be first. MB hoped the first modification would be complete by the end of 2013 but the decision on which radars would be upgraded first is still to be confirmed. MJ asked if there were any other risks to deliver and MB thought the main risks would be supply chain risks and upgrades stalling due to bad weather. DBe was keen to know if this would be run through NERL – the regulated part of NATS and MB confirmed it will be run through the regulated part of the business but it will be off the regulated asset base and will be run by NERL as a commercial opportunity which will place certain restraints on NERL in income generation but as the modification is on NERL’s fleet of radars it was agreed to be the best way to treat this work. AK thought the proposal seemed to stack up but just needed to be wary of future Spectrum implications. AK would speak to Richard Moriarty about this. PA was supportive of the model and asked if initial funders would be fixed or on a variable contribution basis. MB confirmed it could be both.
12. MJ thanked MB for all his work and acknowledged the general support from attendees subject to seeing the final proposal

MOD Update

13. MJ invited DBo and FH to update on progress within DIO and on the Air Traffic Control (ATC) business case respectively. DBo started with an update on Safeguarding . He confirmed that the future operating model for the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) was subject to TU consultation. Pending the outcome of this consultation, it was anticipated that the recruitment process to fill vacant posts in the Safeguarding Team would commence in the coming months. DIO are also looking at options for an online tool for pre-planning purposes. MP asked what the cost of such an online tool would be, but DBo thought it was too early to judge. On Air Defence Radar, trials had now taken place at Sherringham Shoal and MOD are in early discussions with SERCO over single turbines. SH was interested to know if there were many single

turbine applications and DBo estimated that they make up about 80% of applications. PA wondered when MOD could announce the increase in resource and that pre-planning could be re-instated. DBo agreed to take an action away to find out what might be possible.

14. FH opened the next substantive item regarding MOD progress on seeking a solution for ATC mitigation solutions. User Requirements for MOD ATC were now being drafted within the ADATS team and a commitment had been made to publish the document early in 2013. Alongside this a demonstration programme has been drawn up at a high level with expected trial dates in summer 2013. The analysis should be complete in autumn 2013. The main risk to the project going ahead was resourcing, as MOD did not currently have the financial or administrative resource to run it. The other primary risk was also that Solution Providers would not be ready in time although FH had recently been contacted by various solution providers.
15. It is estimated a team of 7 will be needed to run the process from start to finish in these timescales at an estimated cost of £2m. MOD does not have this resource and would be looking for others to contribute, if the project is to progress. MC asked who the Programme Manager is and FH confirmed it would sit within DE&S although this would be a post filled within the 7 person team. MC emphasised that this would need to be built into the Aviation Plan. SH asked when the solution would be in place and FH thought some point in 2015 seemed realistic although it would depend on what the solution was and how long it took to install from the close of the Demonstration programme in Autumn 2013.
16. AK reminded the Board that we would need to be mindful that 2.7MHz – 2.9MHz would not be available in the future. Decisions were being taken at Ministerial level in the near future. AK and FH agreed to discuss in more detail outside the meeting. MP was pleased to see progress and would be happy to consider assistance if it would help speed things up. He also asked if the MOD could use Watchman in civil use to again help accelerate the project. FH thought the URD would help to establish which Watchman can be used for trials, but it would be important that technology solutions could integrate into existing military systems.
17. On funding MJ wondered if the FMB might consider contributing. SH agreed that it might be possible, but it is likely there would be conditions such as a detailed plan with milestones and some way to establish a claw back mechanism for developers who do not contribute to the research costs. SH agreed that he would put it to the FMB when he had more detailed information.

Action 15: FH and CG to ensure the ATC project is built into the Aviation Plan.

Action 16: AK to speak to FH about future spectrum issues for consideration.

Action 17: DECC, MOD and FMB to talk through ATC mitigation demonstration programme proposal.

Aviation Advisory Panel (AAP)

18. CG fed back from the AAP which had met on the 4 October. Met Office were unable to attend but agreed to arrange a separate meeting to talk through next steps on potential mitigation research. More substantively the group had listened to a proposal from Saab Sensis for ATC mitigation. The proposal was looking for funding to carry out research into a software solution for Watchman radars. It was felt a little bit more work was needed and discussions with MOD, NATS and CAA would help develop the business case a little more before the proposal was taken to FMB/AMB.
19. A discussion on the purpose of the AAP also resulted in a clear steer that the AAP should be technology focussed and potentially look at technologies which are at a certain "Readiness Level". CG had agreed to look at ToR and circulate to the group.

Action 18: CG to circulate the draft ToR for the AAP to AMB members also.

Any Other Business

20. SH asked if there was any progress on Eskdalemuir. SC gave a brief outline on progress and highlighted that the workstream had moved to red on the Dashboard. This was primarily due to delays in taking forward the Stage 0 work identified at the last WG. He hoped to have more of an update after the next Eskdalemuir WG on 2 November.
21. Date of the next years meetings of the AMB will be:

22 January 2013
23 April 2013
23 July 2013
22 October 2013

All held 14:00-16:00 at RUK.

END

Annex A

	Owner	Action	Expected Date	Status	Comment
1.	Crown Estate	To complete the mapping project for the next version of the Aviation Plan	17 July 2012	Closed	
2.	DECC	To set up a Working Group to consider regulatory options and update the AMB	15 October 2012	Closed	This action was created to find a claw back mechanism for Raytheon which may no longer be needed under the NATS business model.
3.	RenewableUK	To refresh the Evidence regularly for updates to the Aviation Plan	15 October 2012	Open	
4.	CAA & DECC	To undertake a stocktake on whether there is a need for new or better guidance for LAs to help assess aviation objections in due course.	15 October	Open	Transferred from RUK to CAA
5.	DECC	CG to request further updates and propose a new dashboard for future AMBs. A one off workshop for interested parties may be appropriate.	1 September 2012	Closed	
6.	RenewableUK	PA to link to the Raytheon Executive summary in the next RUK newsletter.	15 October 2012	Closed	
7.	NATs	MB to arrange a meeting of interested parties before the next AMB to update on NATS progress.	1 Oct 2012	Closed	
8.	MoD	DBo to produce some lines to explain cessation of pre-application process.	3 August 2012	Closed	Lines now sent to Paul Askew at RUK
9.	DECC & MoD	SR and CG to meet with MoD to consider next steps	30 Sept	Closed	
10.	MoD	DBo and FH to have a paper on ATC ready for the next meeting of the AMB.	1 Oct 2012	Closed	
11.	DECC and Renewable UK	CG and PA to agree on terms and timing of the next meeting of the AAP.	1 Sept 2012	Closed	
12.	AIFCL	TF to contact the Met Office to arrange a meeting with them and DECC.	1 Oct 2012	Open	
13.	ALL	Workstream owners who had not responded thus far to get in contact with Jon with updates.	12 Nov 2012	Open	

14.	MOD	DBo to consider what a safeguarding workstream would look like ahead of the next AMB.	22 Jan 2013	Open	
15.	DECC and MOD	FH and CG to ensure the ATC project is built into the Aviation Plan.	22 Jan 2013	Open	
16.	CAA and MOD	AK to speak to FH about future spectrum issues for consideration.	22 Jan 2013	Open	
17.	DECC, MOD & FMB	DECC, MOD and FMB to talk through ATC mitigation demonstration programme proposal.	12 Nov 2012	Open	
18.	DECC	CG to circulate draft AAP ToRs to AMB members	22 Jan 2013	Open	