



## **Q&A Technical session**

22 December 2022

Datum	19 January 2023
Status	Final

## Colofon

Contact

[BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl](mailto:BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl)

## Content

<b>1</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>5</b>
1.2	Meetings with European Commission	5
1.3	Timeline process	5
1.4	Government decision	6
1.5	Anticipatory non-enforcement	6
1.6	Involvement other states	6
1.8	Night flights	7
<b>2</b>	<b>Plan of approach</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1	Noise abatement objective	8
2.2	Measures	8
2.3	Cost-effectiveness	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Slots</b>	<b>10</b>

## Introduction

First of all, we would like to thank you for your attendance during the first technical session on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of December. We experienced the session as a productive gathering. Also, we perceive it as a good start for the subsequent technical consultations and follow-up process. During the session, questions were submitted through the online system. In this document, you will find the answers to those questions.

In order to answer all questions in an organized and presentative way, we have bundled the questions per subject. For each subject, we have written a passage, aiming to answer the questions.

Any additional questions can be asked during the second session of the technical cooperation on the 24<sup>th</sup> of January or by sending an email to [BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl](mailto:BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl). You should already have received the invitation for the 24<sup>th</sup> of January.

# 1 Process

## 1.1 Information and presentation

After each technical session, the presentation shown on the screen will be shared with the attendees by email. During the session of the 22<sup>nd</sup> of December, suggestions were made about sharing information in advance of the sessions. This to ensure that the attendees have the opportunity to be properly prepared. We agree that attendees must be able to prepare for the technical session and also believe a proper preparation contributes to the quality of the session. Therefore, we will share the information with the attendees beforehand.

## 1.2 Meetings with European Commission

The preparations for the balanced approach procedure have been running for a while. In the past months, several meeting with the European Commission (EC) have taken place. The representatives from the EC have always emphasized the necessity to follow a careful process in cooperation with the sector and other stakeholders. This is exactly what we aim for with these technical sessions.

## 1.3 Timeline process

From our perspective, the process is based on the steps described in the balanced approach procedure (regulation 598/2014), while keeping in mind to follow a careful process. The preparations for the balanced approach procedure have been going on for a while. As of the session on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, the first formal step of the balanced approach – the technical cooperation – has been taken. The regulation does not prescribe a certain timeframe for the first step. However, we aim for a timeline of approximately three months in which multiple sessions will take place. During this first step, we want to start conversations with the sector and other stakeholders about the noise abatement objective, possible measures, and the analysis on cost effectiveness.

Once the technical cooperation has been rounded up, we go to the next step of the balanced approach procedure; the consultation. We are planning to start this consultation in march. According to the regulation, this step must cover a period of three months. In this period, the sector and other stakeholders will be consulted with the set of documents and studies that has been discussed during the technical cooperation. The consultation is another chance for the sector and other stakeholders to come with suggestions and questions. After three months, the input that is acquired during the consultation will be analyzed and processed.

This will lead to the following step of the balanced approach procedure; the notification period. The regulation prescribes the third step takes a period of six months. At the start of this period, the EC and EU-member states will be notified about the prospective measures to realize the noise abatement objective.

#### **1.4 Government decision**

In terms of time, the decision of cabinet can be divided into two parts. Firstly, the actual political decision-making by the government, and secondly, the implementation of the decision.

This June, the Dutch government made a decision to reduce the capacity at Schiphol airport. The main objective of cabinet's decision is to improve the quality of living in the surrounding of Schiphol Airport. The decision is the outcome of a comprehensive trade-off between a multitude of different public interests, including noise nuisance, legal certainty for residents, an overall attractive and a healthy living environment, and network quality.

The next step is to implement this decision in the airport traffic decree. To do this, we have to follow the balanced approach procedure. We will do this carefully. Other cost effective measures that pop-up during the analyses shall be taken seriously.

#### **1.5 Anticipatory non-enforcement**

As written in the Schiphol Outline Letter of June 24 2022, the Dutch government wants to provide clarity to the people living around Schiphol Airport. Since 2015, the anticipatory non-enforcement is in place. In short, this means that the government (The Human Environment and Transport Inspectorate) does not enforce the operation of Schiphol as long as noise violations caused by flying are in line with the New Standards and Enforcement System. The consequence is that the people living in the surrounding area of Schiphol Airport have no legal basis. In order to repair this legal uncertain situation, the anticipatory non-enforcement will be terminated.

The termination means that we will fall back on the latest applicable legal framework; the Airport Traffic Decree of 2008. Since we will fall back on the latest applicable legal framework and this legal framework originated from before the emergence of Regulation 598/2014, this means that the balanced approach procedure is not applicable.

#### **1.6 Involvement other states**

We are aware of the impact of the lowered capacity limit for the industry. We understand that the Balanced Approach procedure is not only stated in EU legislation, but also has its origin in ICAO rules and on occasion in air services agreements between States. We will carefully follow all the necessary steps of the procedure to comply with both EU legislation as well as ICAO rules and air services agreements.

The government decision is not aimed at restricting traffic rights, of which the granting is organized separately through bilateral and multilateral channels between states. The decision does have an impact on slots. Traffic rights are a separate concept than slots, in the sense that an airline holding traffic rights is not guaranteed the necessary airport slots. Slots are allocated separately under a distinct legal framework and at a later stage.

We value the constructive relationships we have with our bilateral and industry partners. We continuously engage in conversations with them on various topics, including the planned capacity reduction at Schiphol. If you are part of one of these groups and wish to get in touch to discuss concerns, we remain available at all times. Please send us an e-mail at [BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl](mailto:BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl).

**1.7 Phase 3, a new norm based system**

The government has started the process to develop a new norm-based system , that will reduce the noise impact of Schiphol. The development has just started and will take about five years. There is no relation with the Balanced Approach procedure. Nevertheless, the government will consult industry and other stakeholder during the development process.

**1.8 Night flights**

This balanced approach procedure is divided in two parts, the assessment of the reduction of night movements to 29,000 is one of them. Specific research by the Adecs/CE Delft consortium has been conducted and is currently being carried out into the noise effect and the cost-effectiveness of measures regarding night movements at Schiphol, compared to the limitation of nighttime operations. A similar research methodology and approach are taken into account the noise effect and the cost-effectiveness of measures regarding the general noise abatement objective for Schiphol. The study includes measures in every category described in the balanced approach regulation. Hence, the study should provide the required information to present the most cost-effective measure or combination of measures to achieve the specific noise abatement for the night.

## 2 Plan of approach

### 2.1 **Noise abatement objective**

The Dutch Government is defining the noise abatement objective. This will be based on the assessment of the current noise situation and in the past years, while considering the signals from the Health Authorities, citizens living in the surrounding area of the airport, and other relevant factors. In this assessment, we will compare how the situation evolves in the short term without action from the government, and to what extent this differs from the desired situation. As such, we will define a noise objective based on this baseline. During the second session of the technical cooperation, you will be informed about this objective.

### 2.2 **Measures**

Measures will be identified for each of the four pillars of the Balanced Approach. This ranges from measures stimulating fleet renewal to operational restrictions such as reducing the number of movements. To70 will use their vast experience researching noise reduction measures at Schiphol and at other large hub airports. This experience will be used to identify a longlist of possible measures. These are on top of the measures that are mentioned in the 'Minder Hinders Plan' ([www.minderhinderschiphol.nl](http://www.minderhinderschiphol.nl)). A set of selection criteria will be used to identify the alternative measures from the longlist that will be used in the study (shortlist of measures). The selection criteria are related to safety, reliability of airport operation, maintaining the hub function, displacement of noise exposure/nuisance, emissions, feasibility in 2024 and 2027, and significance in relation to the noise reduction target. The impact of the alternative measures (and combinations of them) in the shortlist will be quantified in terms of noise impact and cost effectiveness. All alternative measures (or combinations of measures) that are cost effective to reach the noise reduction target are taken into careful consideration.

As explained during the technical session, the Dutch government decided on three stages in its cabinet decree on Schiphol last summer:

1. Ending anticipatory non-enforcement of noise standards;
2. Short term significant reduction of the noise impact of Schiphol, towards the equivalent of the noise impact of 440.000 movements;
3. Development of a new norm-based system that will enable to reduce the noise impact further from the level under (2). This development could take up to five years.

A noise quota count system is considered one of the many possible variants of a norm-based system as indicated above under (3). Elements of such QC system may or may not be included in the development of the new norms based system for Schiphol. It is, however, not considered an alternative for achieving a short term significant reduction of the noise impact of Schiphol.

### 2.3 **Cost-effectiveness**

The analysis of the cost-effectiveness of measures focuses on (possible) costs for airlines, passengers/freight, airports and government. These costs include operational costs, capital costs, costs of reallocation, travel time/costs for passengers and freight, airport operating costs and governments costs of land use or management measure (e.g., insulation/expropriation). In addition, we will analyze the socioeconomic impacts, like employment measured quantitatively in jobs. The economic impact will be measured using input from the most recent research about economic impact studies of AMS Schiphol and key economic figures from CBS



Statistical Agency and other sources. In addition to the economic impact, we will focus qualitatively on other impacts such as health, safety, and environmental effects.

### 3 Slots

Where the government decision results in a lower number of permissible aircraft movements (hence, forming an environmental limitation), Schiphol's capacity declaration in terms of slots will have to be lowered accordingly. This means that not all claims for historic slots (currently ca. 485.000) can be granted by the coordinator. We understand that this will have effect on the running of the airport and also for airline business operations. The reduction of capacity impacts everyone, including airlines with large slot holdings.

In the Netherlands, Airport Coordination Netherlands (ACNL) has been appointed as the functionally and financially independent slot coordinator for Schiphol. According to EU legislation, ACNL has the exclusive responsibility for the allocation and overall management of slots at Schiphol. We are not involved in ACNL's decision-making process since it is outside our authority to exercise influence over how slots are allocated. ACNL is also responsible for procedures on slot mobility. For more detailed information, this can be found in their Policy Rule on Slot Mobility.

The Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management has, however, asked ACNL to indicate how, in relation to the rules and procedures involving slot allocation, a reduction in the number of aircraft movements and the related slots can be achieved, since current legislation does not provide for such a mechanism. Specifically, we have asked ACNL to advise on 1) a mechanism to effectuate a structural slot reduction in accordance with the decision that has been made, and 2) the process in relation to the reduction of night movements from 32.000 to 29.000 aircraft movements annually. The process also involves matters relating to the impact on the different types of services, including cargo. ACNL has informed us that we will receive their advice this month (in January), as will the industry. The airlines remain responsible for making the commercial decisions on how to allocate their fleet.

We would like to assure you that the Netherlands, via the independent coordinator, will observe the general principles of EU and international aviation law, including the principles of non-discrimination, national (equal) treatment, and transparency, as is also explicitly required by the EU Slot Regulation.



Ministerie van Infrastructuur  
en Waterstaat

## **Q&A Technical session**

24 January 2023

Datum	03 February 2023
Status	Final

## Colofon

Contact

[BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl](mailto:BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl)

## Introduction

First of all, we would like to thank you for your attendance during the second technical session on the 24<sup>th</sup> of January. We experienced the session as a productive gathering. During the session, questions were submitted through the online system. In this document, you will find the answers to those questions.

All the questions have been answered individually.

Any additional questions can be asked during the third session of the technical cooperation by sending an email to [BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl](mailto:BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl). The invitation for the third session will follow shortly.

## 1 Q&amp;A

<b>Question:</b>	<b>Answer:</b>
Is it possible to get an overview of the concrete questions that were asked on 22 December and the answers? Our questions are not answered yet	We sent the participants of the first technical session, which took place on 22 <sup>nd</sup> December, a document with answers to the questions which were asked during that session on 19 <sup>th</sup> January.
Can you give an overview of questions ?	As described in that document's introduction, we decided to bundle your questions based on topic, and answer them by writing one or several paragraphs per topic. At the time, we believed this was the clearest way of answering the questions, as there were many identical questions, or ones which were somehow related to each other.
As you promised, can you please provide answers to all the questions in this session and the last one? The info provided last week does not respond to specific questions. Thank you.	Suggestions were made about answering all the questions separately during the second technical session. We have therefore now changed how we answer the questions.
Is it possible to get an overview of the concrete questions that were asked on 22 December and the answers to them? Our questions (we asked during the session of 22 December) are not answered yet."	
Can you give overview of questions?"	
If you take the Schiphol questions offline, please share detailed answers with everyone., because some of us have the same questions. (about the live conversation with KLM)	As discussed during the session, a bilateral meeting with KLM has been scheduled to discuss and answer the detailed questions KLM came up with during the session.  An additional list of specific questions will be extensively shared after the bilateral meeting.
This is not a proper consultation. You muzzle the Airlines if they have question. It is nice orchestrated but you take the principle of care seriously.! Do not think that by this way of "consulting" you are in a formal and material way careful.	We are currently still in the technical cooperation phase. We would like to get discussions started with the technical stakeholders during this period. The formal consultation will start once the technical cooperation has been completed.
Why isn't the balanced approach being applied in a process-way as envisaged in the relevant regulation? it is my understanding that the pillars must be explored individually and in order, not all at the same time.	The different pillars of the balanced approach are being explored in de current process and the further process to come. So we are not exploring all the pillars at the same time. However to reach the goal there is the possibility that different measures in the different pillars of the balanced approach will be explored together.

<p>We still do not understand how the balanced approach is being followed if you are already talking about reductions of movements. Pillars 1, 2, and 3, are not yet investigated!</p>	<p>The balanced approach study takes all four pillars into consideration. The research focusses on the measures from all pillars which meet the selection criteria mentioned in To70/Decisio's presentation. The cost effectiveness of all these measures will be determined.</p>
<p>Would you still consider alternative measures to mitigate the noise, e.g. quota count system?</p>	<p>We aim to follow a careful process in line with the balanced approach procedure. Part of this process is looking at different kinds of measures which may help reach our noise reduction objective. We will definitely consider implementing any possible cost-effective measures.</p> <p>The noise quota count system is specifically mentioned in the question. The noise quota count system is considered one of the many possible variants of a standards-based system. Elements of such a QC system may or may not be included in the long-term development of Schiphol's new norm based system. It is, however, not considered an alternative for realising a significant short-term reduction of Schiphol's noise impact.</p>
<p>Will you be able to indicate the filter criteria that was used to disqualify each of the long-list initiatives (that were not part of the short-list)?</p>	<p>The process of longlist to shortlist initiatives and which criteria a measure disqualification is based on will be described in the research report which we will share widely in the consultation period.</p>
<p>If airlines want to renew their fleet, this will take 3 to 5 years for a small fleet, even up to ten years for a bigger fleet. So 2024 or 2025 is not really feasible. What is the vision?</p>	<p>The vision is that this development will contribute to the long-term objective of continuously reducing the noise footprint after 2027. However, this development doesn't contribute to the short-term goal.</p>
<p>Why was the fleet renewal scaled to a 2 year timeline in the research by To70? Fleet modernization is a costly, long-term process &amp; 2 years is very short; esp. for cargo where the most modern planes are not yet available.</p>	<p>The baseline scenario involves an estimated level of fleet renewal until November 2024. Autonomous fleet renewal is therefore not considered to be an additional measure, but stimulated fleet renewal incentives are.</p>
<p>Can't you achieve the reduction simply by reducing the number of houses in the affected contour areas by re-locating residents? Did you check if your noise-reduction goals cannot be achieved by implementing this measure?</p>	<p>Expropriation (similar effect as relocation) forms part of the longlist. However, this measure doesn't form part of the shortlist, as there is no legal ground and/or possibility to expropriate people in the short-term (November 2024).</p>

<p>Not considering any measure under pillar 2 is not very neutral and objective. Re-locations of residents can be done in a very short timeframe. A move of a resident to a different area generally only takes a few days. This selection needs to be redone.</p>	<p>Expropriation (similar effect as relocation) forms part of the longlist. However, this measure doesn't form part of the shortlist, as there is no legal ground and/or possibility to expropriate people in the short-term (November 2024).</p>
<p>You said they fit the data to the assumptions? What were the assumptions of the study?</p>	<p>The balanced approach study starts with the noise reduction targets and the assumptions associated with these targets. This includes the fact that the noise reduction target, as well as other criteria mentioned in To70's slides, should be met by November 2024. A longlist of measures was subsequently produced and checked against these criteria.</p>
<p>Autonomous developments are not 100% sure to be implemented, and cannot be taken as autonomous for granted. Put them into measures of the short list.</p>	<p>The developments which form part of the autonomous developments are already in place or ongoing. The expected effects of these developments until 2024 have been taken into consideration. It's assumed that an increased effect of these measures is not feasible until November 2024, with the exception of stimulated fleet renewal. Stimulated fleet renewal is one of the measures on the shortlist.</p>
<p>Please explain again why the Min believe that the BA only needs to be followed when implementing a 440k movement cap whilst the operating restriction will already be implemented for the largest part.</p>	<p>Since the year 2015, the noise-related impacts of air transport operations at Schiphol have not been enforced. This means that there is no valid regulatory framework in place that creates legal certainty for airlines, the airport and citizens. To end this unclear legal position, the government needs to terminate this practice and update the noise limits taking into account what was possible compliant to the prevailing Airport Traffic Decree.</p>
<p>It is not only fall back to LVB2008 but also implement new elements of NNHS.</p>	<p>It is not mandatory to follow the balanced approach because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The anticipatory non-enforcement was meant as a temporary situation (practice) that was not laid down in law in anticipation of an amendment of the Airport Traffic Decree 2008 pending in our Parliament. Continuing this situation (practice) is no longer feasible, because of recent judgments (court cases).</li> <li>○ Therefore we fall back on the prevailing regulatory framework that dates from before the <a href="#">Regulation (EU) No 598/2014</a> for the balanced approach entered into force.</li> <li>○ On top, strictly preferential runway use (an element of the NNHS) – which is the objective of the ministerial regulation that will become effective from the date anticipatory non-enforcement is terminated. Strictly preferential runway use is already in place since 2010.</li> </ul>
<p>"Terminating of anticipatory non-enforcement. and returning to pre 2016 regulation wouldn't need BA; that seems clear. However 'strictly preferential runway use' is not... wouldn't that specific part need a BA?</p> <p>Btw: what is the impact of this runway use?"</p>	



	<p>Hence this dates also before the <a href="#">Regulation (EU) No 598/2014</a> for the balanced approach entered into force.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The purpose of ending the anticipatory non-enforcement and the ministerial regulation is to restore the legal position of local residents and to make sure that flying according to the current operation is possible. So the reason for those measures is not a noise reduction.</li> <li>○ Since 2008 various safety measures, efficiency measures and nuisance mitigation measures have been taken, for which the limit values in the Airport Traffic Decree of 2008 have not been adjusted. As a result, the limit values no longer match the current operation. With the ministerial regulation we enable flying according to the current operation. Updating the limit values is standard procedure in the existing system of limit values at enforcement points. Account must be taken here of the current operation and the assumptions and methods which applied at the time of the determination of the applicable limit values in the LVB (the Environmental Management, Installations and Permits Decree), and the equivalence criteria within which future developments must remain on the grounds of Article 8.17, Section 7 of the Aviation Act</li> </ul>
<p>How would you mitigate the risk of reciprocal actions of third countries that symmetrically could consider reduction of historic slots?</p>	<p>We are aware of the reduced capacity limit's impact on the industry. We are aware of the fact that the Balanced Approach procedure is not only included in EU legislation, but also has its origin in ICAO rules and, on occasion, in air services agreements between States. We will carefully follow all the necessary procedural steps in order to comply with both EU legislation as well as ICAO rules and air services agreements.</p> <p>The government's decision is not aimed at restricting traffic rights, the granting of which is organised separately through bilateral and multilateral channels between states. The decision does have an impact on slots. Traffic rights are a separate concept to slots, in the sense that an airline holding's traffic rights won't guarantee the necessary airport slots. Slots are allocated separately under a distinct legal framework and at a later stage.</p> <p>We value the constructive relationships we have with our bilateral and industry partners. We continuously engage in conversations with them on various topics, including the planned capacity reduction at Schiphol. If you form part of one of these groups and would like to get in touch to discuss any possible concerns, please don't hesitate to contact us any time via <a href="mailto:BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl">BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl</a>.</p>

Why is the objective not set in absolute terms but in relative terms compared to the baseline?	The objective is set in relative terms as, like presented, there's a requirement to make a significant short-term step in terms of noise reduction vis-à-vis the situation without measures in 2024.
Why are the objectives set at -20% and -15%? Why not -80 or -5?	Noise nuisance has increased over the past years, and absolute noise nuisance levels are significant. Health Authorities have warned about the negative health impact this noise nuisance could result in. A significant short-term step to reduce noise is therefore desirable. The presented order of magnitude as a noise abatement objective is such a step. These levels are considered to be achievable.
What are the considerations/basis for 15% and 20% reductions ? Are these achievable?	
Please explain why 20 and 15%.	
The ICAO guidelines on the BA prescribe that the base line case should be projected into the long term to assess whether additional measures are required to achieve the objective. Why does the ministry deviate from this ICAO guidelines?	The Ministry takes full account of EU Regulation 598/2014 to undertake its studies and develop its supporting arguments in the BA-procedure. We will therefore also provide an outlook beyond 2024, just like we've set an objective for beyond 2024 too (in addition to the 2024 objective). The focus in the presentations has therefore indeed been on the short-term.
How do you evaluate who is hindered by noise and by his much?	Who is hindered by noise is assessed in the supporting studies by a dose-response relations model which has been developed for Schiphol. We showed indicators based on the dose-response relations during the technical cooperation session again, but also based this on survey results by the NL Health authorities.
Do you actually measure the noise or are the data based on modeling and/or complaints?	
How do you take into consideration that subjective Noise nuisance is increasing whereas objective Noise pollution per Aircraft is decreasing since years?	Schiphol's data showed us that noise nuisance has (significantly) outpaced traffic growth. It's a fact that aircraft have become quieter over the past decades, also at Schiphol. However, the increase in traffic volume offsets this development.
From a scientific perspective noise nuisance is not similar to noise pollution, If so, noise modelling and noise abatement measures have to be addressed to noise pollution. Correct?	We will assess accepted metrics based on dB Lden in the underlying studies, and will additionally apply accepted dose-response relations to assess the number of people seriously hindered by noise or who suffer serious sleep disturbances.
Paragraph 3.4.3 of the ICAO guidelines do mention and recommend that the base line case should be projected into the long-term (5 of 10 years). Why does the ministry deviate from this?	The Ministry takes full account of EU Regulation 598/2014 to undertake its studies and develop its supporting arguments in the BA-procedure. We will therefore also provide an outlook beyond 2024, just like we've set an objective for beyond 2024 too (in addition to the 2024 objective). The focus in the presentations has therefore indeed been on the short-term.

The government starts GIS4 this quarter of 2023, so isolations must be taken into account	Yes, this has been taken into account in the baseline.
Any resident who moved into the contour areas after the airport was built, should not be considered eligible for any noise relief measures, as they would have had the chance to move to another location. Those people knew that the noise exists around AMS	This is a known factor. However, the nature of the considered measures doesn't distinguish between people who have traditionally always lived around the airport and who have newly settled in the area. Noise nuisance has also grown outside the legally designated areas and has now reached some worrying absolute levels in some municipalities.
When do we receive the To70 and ministry studies?	These are currently works in progress. We will present the key study findings during the third technical cooperation session. We will share the definitive reports of the studies in the consultation period. At the start of the consultation period there will be an information session in which we are happy to answer all additional questions.
Airport charge incentives have been mentioned a number of times as solutions to reduce noise in the short term, however have the lack of available modern aircraft for cargo operators been taken into consideration?	The availability and willingness to change aircraft if airport charges are changed will be taken into consideration. The availability of other aircraft will be based on the fleet composition per airline at Schiphol and the willingness will be determined based on the type of airline and the profitability and importance of certain routes/regions.
ICAO Doc 9829 says that operating restrictions should only be applied as a last resort, after the other elements have been considered and applied where appropriate. Does that fit to your approach?	The balanced approach study takes all four pillars into consideration. The research focusses on the measures from all pillars which meet the selection criteria mentioned in To70/Decisio's presentation. The cost effectiveness of all these measures will be determined.
Article 5,2 states that you must calculate the cost-effectiveness of each measure. Why does the ministry deviate from this?	We will calculate the cost effectiveness of the measures we have compiled in the shortlist. These measures meet the selection criteria we mentioned in our presentation.
Article 5, 2 states that you must calculate the cost-effect of every measure.	
What is the width of the economic impact assessment: only aviation/airport related or also impact on economy in general?	We will assess the direct and indirect economic impact of the measures, mostly in relation to jobs and added value. This means suppliers who deliver goods and services to the aviation industry will also be taken into account. We will assess the qualitative effect on the business environment and the economy as a whole.

<p>Consider and quantify the economic impact to the Dutch economy! This also means taking into account businesses which leave the Netherlands due to not being able to receive current air cargo services from integrators!</p>	<p>We will pay specific attention to air freight and cargo to calculate the economic impact. We are well aware that the air cargo industry is different from the air passenger industry. Air cargo is more labour intensive and specific industries rely on air cargo services. We will devote attention to this in our analysis.</p>
---	---



## **Q&A Technical Session 3**

Balanced Approach procedure

Date	7 april 2023
Status	Final

## Colofon

Contact

[BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl](mailto:BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl)

## Introduction

On March 8<sup>th</sup>, the Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management organized the third technical session as part of the Balanced Approach procedure. We have experienced it again as a useful session.

During the third and final technical session various questions were asked. In this document you will find all questions and answers.

If there are any additional questions or issues that come up, please contact us at [BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl](mailto:BA.stakeholders@minienw.nl).

## 1 Q&amp;A

<b>Question:</b>	<b>Answer:</b>
<b>Was LVNL consulted on slide 13 items ?</b>	The longlist (and shortlist) of measures on the slide came from various sources, including the 'less noise nuisance Schiphol'. The Ministry asked LVNL to undertake a feasibility/execution test during the consultation period.
<b>The slotcoordinator was very sceptic on the timelines: what is your reaction?</b>	As one of the first steps towards implementation, we have asked slot coordinator ACNL to develop a mechanism for the structural reduction of slots. On February 13th, ACNL has published its concept policy rule, proceeding from the proportionality principle. After a consultation with industry parties, we expect to have a final version of the policy rule before SHL on April 17th. We realize that this is the first time that a Balanced Approach procedure and slot reduction of this magnitude is being conducted, so it is new to all parties involved. Nonetheless, we are working to effectuate the Schiphol decision as per the communicated timelines.
<b>Which Aircraft mix did you consider for the baselline scenario?</b>	The baseline scenario is based on the 2023 traffic forecast with 495,485 movements (31,300 night flights) made by the Royal Schiphol Group. Our baseline scenario includes autonomous developments and has 500,000 movements (32,000 night flights). See paragraph 2.4 of the 2023 prognosis for the aircraft mix: <a href="https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/rapporten/2022/12/20/2022292401-2-bijlage-schiphol-gebruiksprognose-2023">https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/rapporten/2022/12/20/2022292401-2-bijlage-schiphol-gebruiksprognose-2023</a>
<b>How was the baseline scenario derived ? Which physical measures equipment were taken into account ? From which period pls ?</b>	Starting point for this research was the 2023 traffic forecast with 495,485 movements (31,300 night flights). A number of modelling steps were taken to model the baseline scenario, which includes the autonomous developments and has 500,000 movements (32,000 night flights). The following autonomous developments are part of the baseline scenario: 1. The impact of increased arrival runway capacity 2. Fleet renewal as expected until november 2024 3. Increased use of reduced flaps operations 4. Increased use of CDA's for runway 18C and 06 during 2+1 runway use
<b>what is the housing file (woningbestand)</b>	The 2021 residential data has been used, containing



<b>you are using?</b>	existing houses.
<b>is there a difference in method of the calculation for the baseline versus the gebruiksprognose from Schiphol?</b>	No, the calculation method is the same (same noise model, same noise load database). The input data is however different, because the gebruiksprognose has less movements and doesn't take autonomous developments until november 2024 into consideration.
<b>is the system which is used for the calculation of the measures able to deal with all kind of measures or are there limitations?</b>	Measures that couldn't be modelled didn't made the shortlist since this was one of the selection criteria.
<b>We are interested in understanding the studies referred to on slide 13</b>	Please see the appendices of the consultation document.
<b>Did you analyze impact of flight restrictions at any level other than 440k?</b>	In the consultation document we published three combinations of possible measures. Two of the combinations contain a maximum capacity of 440.000 movements. One of the combinations does not contain a maximum capacity of 440.000 movements, but instead a maximum amount of 25.000 night flights per year.
<b>Why is not a noise cap considered instead of a movement cap?</b>	The starting point of the Balanced Approach is the definition of a noise objective. How this noise objective is reached is the next step of the procedure. The impact on noise of the reduction of flights are tested against the noise objective.
<b>What is the number of highly annoyed people referred to ? Is there a precise location on their situation ?</b>	The number of highly annoyed people is calculated based on the noise exposure in each house in the residential area. The Schiphol dose response function is used to calculate this. When the number of highly people per house is calculated, a summation is made of all the houses with a specific noise exposure or higher is made to calculated the total number of highly annoyed people within noise contours.
<b>Schiphol has 6 runways, other airports operate with 2 and handle more traffic. Close the 18R/36L and rehabilitate the land. Proper ATC procedures would not impact traffic capacity but will save a lot fuel</b>	Closing or partially closing runways has been considered as an additional measure. Runway 18R/36L is a preferential runway for noise and therefore not considered to be an effective measure to meet the noise abatement objectives. Also see the rationale about choosing for a partial closure of runway 09/27 as an additional measure in the To70 report.
<b>How will you assess slot reductions for the period 2140LT to 2300LT considering historical operations of carriers?</b>	If this question is related to the extension of the night regime measure: an assessment of slot reductions for this measure is not part of the executed studies.

<p><b>Why is the capping is at 58dB? Why is this not applied for highways and railways too?</b></p>	<p>The impact of the measure have been assessed on the noise exposure levels from the noise abatement objectives.</p>
<p><b>It is correct that there are differences between GP2023, although how do you explain differences around 25%? This is not a difference of small growth and autonomous developments.</b></p>	<p>There are indeed differences between the GP2023 and the baseline scenario. The residential situation used to count the number of houses in the GP2023 is also different from the residential situation that is used in the baseline scenario (2005 vs. 2021). These differences result in different results.</p>
<p><b>Extend of night regime will lead to less capacity. What is the exact reduction in capacity (arr dep) during the mentioned time period?</b></p>	<p>The exact reduction in capacity during the mentioned time is not determined. It does not necessarily lead to an overall reduction. The differences in the number of movements is however reported in Appendix A of the To70 report.</p>
<p><b>Can you elaborate on 'extending the night regime until 07:00'? Doesn't the current night regime already run until 07:00?</b></p>	<p>The night time period is defined from 23:00 – 07:00 LT. In practice, the night regime (preferential runway use) is operational from 22:40 – 06:40. The night regime (preferential runway use) has been extended from 06:40 – 07:00.</p>
<p><b>Have the possible effects of the Single European Sky project have been taken into account in regards to the proposed measures?</b></p>	<p>Single European Sky (SES) aims to improve the performance of the European ATM Network by for example the reduction of delays and shortening of flight routes to reduce emissions. The noise exposure around airports is not a performance target in SES and therefore not taken into account.</p>
<p><b>What is to be expected from fleet renewal on the long run, say within 5 or 10 years?</b></p>	<p>This is (partially) answered in chapter 7 'Perspective to 2027' of the to70 report. To70 was asked to look at what measures are expected to have an effect until 2027, including fleet renewal.</p>
<p><b>Will the night regime extension impact capacity now allocated to airlines ?</b></p>	<p>The analysis has been based on the starting point that the night time reduction would result in delays and would not affect the capacity allocated to airlines. As such, it has been considered as an operational measure and not as an operation restriction. The costs of these delays have been included in the cost-effectiveness analysis.</p>
<p><b>Looking at the 3.6% effect of fleet renewal, does this mean that 20% can be achieved within <math>20/3.6 = 5.5</math> years?</b></p>	<p>No this is not the case, although the rationale that the fleet renewal process follows a trendline is correct. However, the 3.6% reduction is based on the location of the noise contours. Further reduction of the noise exposure doesn't have to result in a reduction of houses.</p>
<p><b>Where can we find the detailed analysis reports? And specifically how the noise objectives (%) have been calculated and the baseline number of people highly annoyed have</b></p>	<p>All reports are available via: <a href="https://www.luchtvaartindetoekomst.nl/onderwerpen/amenwerking/ba/english-version">https://www.luchtvaartindetoekomst.nl/onderwerpen/amenwerking/ba/english-version</a></p>

<b>been assessed?</b>	
<b>What would be the net effect for nuisance of more reductions in the night and less during the day?</b>	Three variants of night time reductions have been calculated. Also, two variants of the reduction to 440.000 have been calculated (with 32.000 and 29.000 night flights).
<b>What was the justification to extend the night flights to 21:40?</b>	The night time period is defined from 23:00 – 07:00 LT. In practice, the night regime (preferential runway use) is operational from 22:40 – 06:40. To70 expects that preferential runway use between 21:40 – 22:40 is possible (while excepting some operational inefficiencies) when comparing the number of movements within this timeframe with other periods with only preferential runways in use during the day. And it has a significant effect on the reduction of noise nuisance.
<b>How does extending the night regime relate to the Dutch industrial night of 2300-0700?</b>	The night time period is defined from 23:00 – 07:00 LT. In practice, the night regime (preferential runway use) is operational from 22:40 – 06:40. The night regime (preferential runway use) has been extended from 06:40 – 07:00.
<b>The proposed plan to extend the night regime period from 2140LT to 0700LT needs to be reviewed. Can the night regime period remain as it is today and just focus on reductions during this period?</b>	To70 researched the potential noise reduction by extending the night regime alongside measures to reduce the number of movements during the night. Decisio focused on the cost-effectiveness of both measures. Views are welcomed on the trade-off between these during the consultation.
<b>How many arr and dep will be effected during night regime.Extension</b>	The exact reduction in capacity during the mentioned time is not determined. It does not necessarily lead to an overall reduction. The differences in the number of movements is however reported in Appendix A of the To70 report.
<b>Various questions about sharing the reports.</b>	All reports are available via: <a href="https://www.luchtvaartindetoekomst.nl/onderwerpen/amenwerking/ba/english-version">https://www.luchtvaartindetoekomst.nl/onderwerpen/amenwerking/ba/english-version</a> .  On this website instructions on how to leave behind your response are available.
<b>So this is not a consultation ? And stakeholders will be consulted later ?</b>	This was the third and final technical sessions, part of the prescribed technical cooperation. The next step in the Balanced Approach procedure is the consultation.
<b>Can we suggest having a chat system that provides overview on all questions asked to have full transparency ?</b>	Hereby you will find all questions asked during the session.
<b>what is the official time frame that is legally set for the consultation?</b>	As prescribed by the Balanced Approach procedure, this is three months.

<b>where can we find the official procedure and timing that was just explained</b>	We are following the Balanced Approach procedure, described in Regulation (EU) 598/2014.
<b>please explain in 'normal' language what does 'Number of houses within 48 dB Lnight' and what is Lden?</b>	Lden and Lnight are descriptors of the noise level. These are European standards. Lden provides the annual average noise level for the entire <u>day-evening-night</u> period, and Lnight provides the annual average noise level for the night period only. One can calculate the noise level expressed Lden or Lnight for the area around an airport (or road or railway track). Based on this, a contour can be defined for the area with the same noise level. For example the area with a noise exposure of 58 dB Lden of 48 dB Lnight. Finally one can count the number of houses in such contour, to arrive at the metric as presented. For more information, please refer to general sources about noise metrics, e.g.: <a href="https://anima-project.eu/nl/bp-detail/european-indicators">https://anima-project.eu/nl/bp-detail/european-indicators</a> <a href="https://www.eea.europa.eu/help/glossary/eea-glossary/liden">https://www.eea.europa.eu/help/glossary/eea-glossary/liden</a>
<b>Will there be published one sole combined solution to meet targets or will multiple solutions be published with the cost effective analysis?</b>	The consultation document will include three combinations of measures, including their cost-effectiveness.
<b>In the study for the night, measures were identified and taken by the sector already but not taken into account due to system limitations for calculation. How to deal with this?</b>	Measures that are already taken by the sector, have been incorporated into the baseline scenario. The studies have been done in accordance with Regulation (EU) 598/2014. The consultation document presents three combinations of possible measures with sufficient impact to achieve the noise abatement objective. Participants in this consultation are invited to respond to the selection, composition, effect and desirability of the three combinations of measures that are presented. Participants are also invited to propose alternative measures or alternative combinations of measures that could achieve the noise abatement objective and can be achieved by November 2024.
<b>I sent a question about the night flights. Second slide Study has done a few yrs ago. Are the costs correct with inflation are or those actual?</b>	The update has been done to provide actual costs and align with the To70/Decisio studies.
<b>the report for the night reduction identified measures taken by the sector but couldn't be taken into account due to system limitation for calculation. how to deal with this?</b>	The studies have been done in accordance with Regulation (EU) 598/2014. The consultation document presents three combinations of possible measures with sufficient impact to achieve the noise abatement objective. Participants in this consultation are invited to respond to the selection, composition, effect and desirability of the three combinations of

	measures that are presented. Participants are also invited to propose alternative measures or alternative combinations of measures that could achieve the noise abatement objective and can be achieved by November 2024.
<b>In the second session it was stated that stakeholders should be assessed for the cost effectiveness analysis. As a stakeholder we were not contacted. Can you give a list of consulted stakeholders?</b>	In the second session we identified the stakeholders or actors at Schiphol that would be affected by the measures. We have assessed their behavioral reactions with a grounding in theoretical studies and practical evidence. Consultation of stakeholders was not part of the technical cooperation phase. The next step in the Balanced Approach procedure is the consultation.
<b>Why aren't noise and some other emissions not included in the benefits?</b>	The noise impact is measured in terms of reduced number of houses and highly annoyed persons within the noise contours and is part of the cost-effectiveness equation. The noise impact is not monetised and included as a cost savings as that would mean that the same impact would be included in both sides of the equation. Other emissions have been included in the benefits.
<b>CBA guidelines contain more emissions, at least noise</b>	Noise is included as part of the cost-effectiveness equation, see previous answer.
<b>As you state: reduction of CO2 emissions have an effect on a global level. Can you elaborate on that effect? What will the effect of this reduction be on the global amount of CO2 emissions?</b>	We look at net effects of CO2 taking into account deviating passengers and freight to other airport because of a reduction in flights at Schiphol. Not all flights will deviate to other airports as there is a reduction in demand by passengers and freight because of longer travel times and higher ticket prices. This means a reduction of flights on a global scale including their CO2 emissions. For the 440k scenario we estimate a net reduction of 154.000 tons of CO2 emissions in 2024 (yearly basis). See the report for a more detailed explanation.
<b>I didn't understand the negative impact in NL balanced by a positive impact of jobs in other countries like Germany and Belgium. Can you expand on this point ?</b>	As described in the previous answer, flights deviate to other airports abroad. This means an increase in employment at those airports.
<b>Is it correct to assume that overall airport charges will decrease by 12 % when overall movements will decrease by 12 % ?</b>	Airport charges at airports should be cost-based (EU Directive 2009/12/EC) and total revenue should not exceed total costs. This means that if total costs for the airport also decrease with 12% the total revenue from airport charges will also have to decrease with 12%. However, total costs for the airport might decrease less than 12%, when overall movements decrease with 12%, because of less efficient use of infrastructure.

<b>are the costs per annum or one offs?</b>	The costs are per annum in 2024.
<b>Is there a standard or a norm that you used to assess the cost-effectiveness of these measures?</b>	We use broad definition of costs which aligns with the approach used in Cost-Benefit Analyses (CBA) in particular the guideline on aviation specific CBA's (Werkwijzer Luchtvaartspecifieke MKBA's, SEO/Decisio 2021)
<b>Start implementing continuous decent approaches as Schiphol is the worst performer in our network</b>	Implementing and increasing the use of CDAs for the short term is an autonomous development and part of the baseline scenario.
<b>The costs of 29 k night mvts are corrected with inflation rate? The study has done a few years ago</b>	We performed new calculations of noise, traffic and costs of the night flights in collaboration with to70.
<b>Further time is needed to fully analyse the data before comments can be made. For these calculations, are the larger global impacts taken into account? and not just domestic?</b>	We look at the costs on a global scale where relevant. This is particularly the case with net external costs.
<b>The larger regional and global economic impact needs to be taken into consideration for any cost effectiveness study for a true analysis to be made.</b>	The gross economic impacts in the Schiphol area and the rest of the Netherlands are estimated as part of the cost effectiveness study. Effects on global supply chains, networks and related investment decisions of specific airlines are not part of this gross economic impact analysis. As this falls beyond the scope of this study.