

File Name: ISH6 30th April 2024 Part 4.mp3
File Length: 01:12:42

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:06 - 00:00:41:26

So the time is now. 345. Time to resume this hearing. So we're now on to item eight on the agenda which is emissions assessments operational phase. And the agenda says the applicant will be asked about greenhouse gas emissions during the operational phase in respect of airport buildings and ground operations, surface access and aviation emissions, including but not limited to, alternative fuels and nascent technology and greenhouse gas emissions trading and offsetting.

00:00:42:08 - 00:00:53:07

And 8.2 the issue of non CO2 impacts will also be addressed. So there's quite a lot there. But um a very little on the first part. The.

00:00:56:04 - 00:00:59:08

The only question I have here is, um.

00:01:02:07 - 00:01:31:16

For the applicant to respond to the statements from various local authorities that under the I EMA greenhouse gas assessment methodology used in the year, the applicant must update the assessments to evidence that exclusions are greater than 1% of total emissions and where all such exclusions total a maximum of 5%. So.

00:01:33:07 - 00:01:37:03

This is page 19 of the

00:01:39:03 - 00:01:39:23

um.

00:01:42:21 - 00:01:52:17

The applicant's response, I think. Does the applicant accept that those exclusions are greater than 1% of total emissions in the first place?

00:01:55:20 - 00:01:57:15

Sorry. Keith Robertson for the applicant.

00:01:59:00 - 00:02:08:13

This this links back to the to the whole life carbon, uh, conversation we've had throughout the day. Yeah. Um, the.

00:02:10:15 - 00:02:41:29

The item we discussed earlier was around, well, two time commissions. Um, which, uh, we've, we've taken away and said we'll do something on for deadline for. I think the other item that was raised in some of the representations was around the, uh, the, the maintenance and replacement emissions for um, their classed as operational emissions, although effectively they had done largely to buildings and built infrastructure, but they are classed as operational emissions.

00:02:42:12 - 00:02:58:25

Um the the emissions associated with them uh in the context of the assessment as a whole, they are small, but we can provide further details on that as part of that deadline for submission. Just to clarify the approach we've taken on that.

00:02:59:06 - 00:03:00:14

Yep. Okay. Thank you.

00:03:04:12 - 00:03:07:04

So moving on to surface access.

00:03:14:24 - 00:03:51:17

Um. A number of relevant reps stated that carbon emissions from additional surface transport journeys are not insignificant and must be assessed separately against national road sector targets and policies, and local transport plans for climate strategies for Sussex and Surrey. So the applicant responded to that. Those relevant reps were up 148, indicating that various stakeholders have their own commitments and reductions trajectories.

00:03:51:19 - 00:04:21:21

But the test applied to to assess significance of impacts arising and carried out in line with the EMA guidance by comparison to national carbon budgets and contextualized against appropriate sectoral trajectories to achieve net zero at a national scale. So I think this comes back to one of the answers the applicant gave on a slightly different topic, but similar. Um.

00:04:24:00 - 00:04:33:02

Mr. Bedford, do you want to say any more on this, given it came from your country in the first place, about particularly about the local transport plans and climate strategies?

00:04:33:29 - 00:04:34:17

It's a very.

00:04:34:19 - 00:05:14:12

Little. Thank you, Michael Bedford, for the joint local authorities, sir. Um, clearly the applicant has contextualised, um, in relation to the jet zero, uh, strategy, but the chapter 16 doesn't provide contextualization against other any other non national benchmarks. I have to say, um, simply speaking, now I am not sufficiently informed as to which local transport plan and or other local strategy document we would refer to.

00:05:14:14 - 00:05:39:17

So I think probably the best thing to do is in our post hearing submissions is identify which documents we think should be contextualized together with the ones that the applicant has undertaken, so that you've got a clear picture. And obviously, if we need to supply you with extracts from those documents so that you can see what the local, uh, targets or budgets are, then we'll do that.

00:05:40:05 - 00:05:40:28

Okay. Thank you.

00:05:43:18 - 00:05:45:19

So, Mr. Robertson, do you want to come back?

00:05:45:22 - 00:06:20:00

Keith Robertson for the applicant. Um, we have contextualised surface access emissions against the UK carbon budgets, as we've done for all four of the assessments, individually and in aggregate. And also, I think, uh, within around section 16.9 .59, we contextualize surface access against the CTC. So

the Climate change Committee's balanced pathway trajectory for transport. So there is additional contextualization for surface access emissions in there already.

00:06:20:29 - 00:06:27:07

Okay. Thank you. Sorry sir. Scotland's for the applicant will obviously listen or read what I say.

00:06:27:09 - 00:06:28:21

But uh.

00:06:28:27 - 00:07:01:12

Our position as a matter of standards, we do not see any justification for requiring an assessment of significance to be conducted on a local or restricted geographical, uh, basis. Um, partly because one's looking at GHG emissions, which are effectively a global, uh, impact, and those emissions do not have a geographical boundaries such. So our position is subject to seeing what is said by the local authorities that there's no requirement for us to do this on a, on a localized scale.

00:07:02:04 - 00:07:02:19

Okay.

00:07:02:28 - 00:07:03:13

Sorry.

00:07:03:28 - 00:07:37:08

Michael Bedford I just come back briefly on that. So the EMA guidance, which the applicant suggests that it has followed in section 6.4 when it talks about contextualization, does make it very clear that if there are local, uh, targets, strategies or budgets, then you should consider to contextualize against those. And it gives in its examples in figure six, uh, a local borough council carbon budget, um, as one of the examples.

00:07:37:10 - 00:08:12:17

So I say if, if, let's say the local transport plan does set out for whether it's East Sussex or West Sussex figures, then they would be relevant. And that's what I say will identify to you in our post hearing submissions. But in terms of the approach, we don't accept that, um, if you're doing it in a way which is EMA compliant, that you're able to simply say if there are national sorry, if there are subnational targets, that you don't need to consider contextualizing yourself against them, that would not be EMA compliant.

00:08:13:10 - 00:08:14:00

Okay. Thank you.

00:08:14:29 - 00:08:34:24

Scotland. Applicant. I think we can deal with this further. In writing, we can refer to cases which have considered this issue before. Well, there are practical difficulties. In any event, apart from the question of principle and working at what baseline, for example, you're measuring against um, and contacts with global emissions. But rather than prolong the debate today, you can do that further and. Right.

00:08:34:27 - 00:08:36:02

Sounds good. Thank you.

00:08:40:06 - 00:09:15:28

So let's move on then to aviation emissions. And let's start with comments from AF, um, government rep, which indicated that downward revision of the level of demand forecasted by the government

from 70% to 50% within the space of a year because the publication sorry, between the publication of the Jet Zero strategy and Jet zero one year On illustrates how vulnerable estimates are to change.

00:09:17:22 - 00:09:20:11

Um. Now.

00:09:22:06 - 00:09:26:12

The applicant did respond to that. Um,

00:09:28:04 - 00:09:40:06

suggesting that it wasn't a robust objection to the application itself. But, uh, Mr. Johnson, are you still there? Would you like to comment further on that? And then I'll ask the applicant to to respond.

00:09:43:07 - 00:09:43:22

Uh, thank.

00:09:43:24 - 00:10:31:12

You, Tim Johnson for Aviation Environment Federation. Uh, yes. I mean, I think the numbers in question, just so we're all on the same page, is, I believe, in the, um, jet zero. I think the forecast level of national growth above 2018 levels was something like 72%, and it went down to just around 50% in jet zero one year on, published 12 months later. When we inquired from of the department the reasons why this this change had taken place, they said it largely related to changes in forecast global GDP, and they had overestimated GDP to many of the regions, um, uh, that flights from the UK were operating to, um, underestimated in some other situations.

00:10:31:14 - 00:11:04:02

But the net effect, um, of the adjustments to the modeling forecasts based on the latest sort of economic outlooks, was this this reduction in overall national capacity from, from around 70% to around 50%. And I say that that took place within 12 months. So I, I suppose our our point was to illustrate, firstly that the numbers that are in jet zero are really illustrative modelling, and I think that's the way the department has, has consistently referred to.

00:11:04:04 - 00:11:33:25

But but also that they are highly dependent on the assumptions that you put in. And even small changes to, to some of the assumptions can have quite significant impacts in terms of the results that that are generated. So if nothing else, I think it suggested, uh, the need for quite sort of robust sort of sensitivity analysis around, around some of the assumptions and some of the testing, uh, of the numbers that were in there, because obviously they relate very clearly to, to the case we have here.

00:11:34:29 - 00:11:37:02

Thank you, Mr. Linus.

00:11:37:23 - 00:11:53:25

Scott. Linus, the applicant. Insofar as this is teeing up suggestions, sensitivity analysis should be carried out. I think we've dealt with that already. In short, um, government policy, uh, hasn't changed a result of the forecast changing. And we're entitled to rely on any event on the forecast as provided.

00:11:54:14 - 00:11:55:06

Okay. Thank you.

00:12:14:15 - 00:12:48:03

Um, we touched on this before, but, um. I'd like to ask about. I'd like to ask the IPS to respond to the applicant's comments about the exclusion of inbound flights from the assessments, uh, being wholly

consistent with the assessment framework, with the assessment framework, which is contextualizing against a the UK carbon budgets and B the jet zero strategy.

00:12:49:10 - 00:12:49:25

Um.

00:12:54:19 - 00:13:16:16

I'd like those. Any general comments on that? But there's an issue here that, um, if we recognize that inbound flights should be accounted for in the country of origin. It would still be useful to have a figure of additional emissions from inbound flights, if it's only for information, and then beyond that.

00:13:18:08 - 00:13:25:09

Because this scheme would result in additional inbound flights.

00:13:27:06 - 00:13:28:21

His consent was granted.

00:13:30:27 - 00:13:43:14

They shouldn't they be included because they would generate an increase in emissions elsewhere in the world that otherwise wouldn't occur in the absence of the northern runway projects.

00:13:46:15 - 00:14:19:27

Uh, Scotland. If the applicant allows Mr. Robertson to comment on why this approach was taken. Um, the introductory comment I'd make is that one must always come back to a policy, which is the effect of this project on this country's carbon budgets. So if the emissions are effectively taking place and have their origin in a different jurisdiction, and that justifies the approach of not including them in our own carbon assessment as opposed to us, including the emissions that result from flights would take off from here from the UK.

00:14:20:14 - 00:14:30:13

Well, on on one level that makes sense because you're following the guidance, but on the logical level, doesn't it? Question.

00:14:32:24 - 00:14:37:21

How those emissions are generated. It's through your scheme, isn't it? Sure.

00:14:38:08 - 00:15:07:22

I asked Mr. Robertson to deal with that. But just as if we are including emissions that result from flights which take off in this country, but also travel outside the UK and land in other country. Um, including those emissions means that we shouldn't then be required to include emissions which start in other country and arrive in this one. Otherwise there's a, there's a, there's a sense of additional content which is unjustified being included in the assessment. I can ask Mr. Robertson to explain the rationale behind that.

00:15:09:24 - 00:15:13:20

Keith Iverson for the applicant. It's, uh.

00:15:16:09 - 00:15:34:25

It. It's a it's a standard approach internationally for, uh, the accounting of emissions from aviation to be attributed to the source of the departing aircraft, not from not from inbound aircraft. So that's the basis of, um.

00:15:36:18 - 00:16:12:25

Of, uh, of international agreement. But as Mr. Linus said, it's also. Also taking that approach is, is the only approach we can use if we want to then contextualize against carbon budgets and zero for the UK, because that's the basis, the basis on which those budgets are developed, uh, is in line with, um, the National Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and that methodology which, which drives the national reporting of, of greenhouse gases on the accounts for, for outward flights from the UK.

00:16:13:09 - 00:16:16:16

Okay. So the question then about um.

00:16:18:24 - 00:16:44:12

Could you produce a figure for the additional emissions from inbound flights for information to help us? Is that possible? I mean, is it as simple as saying because all flights starts in one place and then somewhere else? Is the number of inbound flights the same as outbound or similar?

00:16:49:00 - 00:16:50:19

Keith Robertson for the applicant.

00:16:53:12 - 00:17:20:08

The. The emissions, all the emissions. I mean, we can we can estimate them. And one methodology we might take to do that would be what you suggested. But what do we then do with that number? Because the test we're using here is to look at, uh, the frameworks in place nationally for the UK to manage domestic greenhouse gas emissions. So if you.

00:17:22:19 - 00:17:51:23

I can generate estimates of greenhouse gas emissions for lots of flight opportunities. Um, I'm not quite sure how we would then either contextualize them because, you know, they rely on on inbound flights from a wide range of, of international destinations. So there's then no practical way of contextualizing them, uh, for, for, for, for inward flights. So, so it's feasible, but I'm not sure I.

00:17:51:25 - 00:18:07:19

Accept it would be outside of what's the regular the guidance says. But, um, it might help us to understand this wider picture of what the scale of emissions are.

00:18:11:18 - 00:18:12:16

Let's move on.

00:18:13:03 - 00:18:46:15

Um. Yes, sir. Scott Leonard for the applicant. I think the difficulty we'd have with that is that we wouldn't consider those omissions, frankly, to be part of this examination, because what we have done is assess emissions resulting from flights which leave this country, um, and land in another land and other country. And we've included those emissions within our assessment, any emissions that arise from flights which depart from other country but land in the UK, they would contribute towards emissions created in that country of um, uh, origin.

00:18:46:21 - 00:19:17:10

It's not for it's not for this project to assess them when considering the significance, uh, attributable to this, uh, to this project. So, um, I mean, perhaps if so, you reflect on whether you need that, uh, material for, uh, for information. But I think our, our position is that we would not want it to be suggested that this material should somehow be taken into account when assessing the significance of this, of this project, based on comparing it against national budgets under policy.

00:19:17:28 - 00:19:43:22

Yeah, I understood that you want that caveat on that information. And as I said, it would be for information. Um, I'm still not sure I got the full answer then to this extra 13 million passengers a year in the flights that's accommodating their movements, because they wouldn't exist if it wasn't for your scheme.

00:19:54:27 - 00:19:55:12

This.

00:20:00:21 - 00:20:21:25

Yes. Um. Scotland. So perhaps we should take that, um, away of the 13 million as a reference to the difference between the project and the future baseline. We say we have taken that into account as part of our, um, assessment. But perhaps the easiest way to do that is for us to just explain.

00:20:21:27 - 00:20:22:12

Explain.

00:20:22:14 - 00:20:25:07

That in the context of our methodology. If we take that away.

00:20:25:09 - 00:20:28:25

Okay. Thank you. Um, Mr. Asher, I think he's got his hand up.

00:20:30:12 - 00:21:01:17

Yeah. Finlay Asher from Safe Landing. I'm just wondering, um, in the historical context of air traffic growth, as there's been a trend for increasing distance, um, average distance of flights. So just wondering when you are calculate it in the methodology when you're calculating the increase in emissions from X percent more flights, whether you assumed, um, because you're assuming probably some efficiency improvement of the aircraft.

00:21:01:23 - 00:21:34:00

Uh, but what we tend to find is that. Even though we make aircraft more efficient, we tend to also fly further and use that efficiency to fly further, rather than to fly the same distance and get an efficiency saving. So I was wondering whether when you're modeling the increase in aviation emissions, you're taking into account aircraft actually flying further with time? Um, this might be particularly relevant if, you know, at Gatwick there's an increase in sort of flights to, um, north South America compared to Europe, for example.

00:21:37:05 - 00:22:12:09

Keith Robertson for the applicant. We our assessment is not a scaling up exercise based on a percentage more flights. What we have taken is the the forecasts for flights to different destinations using different aircraft. And we've used uh, the the standard EU calculation tool for measuring the fuel use associated with flights to those range of destinations. So it's not it's not simply it's not simply that we have scaled up by a percentage to match the percentage of of Pax or something.

00:22:12:11 - 00:22:32:04

We have actually modelled what the destinations are forecast to be and what aircraft will be, will be making those flights when we've when we've estimated the fuel consumption and the GHG emissions associated with that. So I think the, the, the query that we haven't accounted for longer flights is is is is not appropriate. We have done that.

00:22:32:24 - 00:22:33:18

Okay. Thank you.

00:22:34:06 - 00:22:36:18

Okay. Thank you. Yes. Councillor Wessex.

00:22:37:10 - 00:23:17:14

Thank you. I don't know if it would be appropriate to suggest that it would be very useful for that information, that sort of working to be shared so everyone can see how the numbers which Gatwick are claiming have been calculated. And in terms of, um, their explanation as to why it's not appropriate to consider the arriving as well as the departing flights, I wonder if one way to frame that would be if a project is based in the UK and half of its impact is elsewhere, but it has exactly the same impact on the climate. Why should the airports industry consider themselves to be worthy of some kind of special case that bypasses legislation which would apply to every other sector in the same way?

00:23:18:06 - 00:23:21:23

Thank you. Um, before you answer that, um, Mr. Han.

00:23:23:27 - 00:24:03:00

But. So thank you, Estelle, to hold on behalf of Cagney. Two points. The first one picks up on that issue. There's there is a question, a legal question about downstream emissions and the extent to which that's taken into account, even where the emissions occur outside of the United Kingdom. Um, and indeed, it's been recognized that those kind of downstream emissions are relevant as a planning and material planning consideration. So in the same way, upstream emissions that occur outside of the United Kingdom are also relevant as a material planning consideration, even though they are not to be contextualized within the context of the UK's carbon budgets.

00:24:04:06 - 00:24:57:27

And indeed, there's case law on that. There's the Kilkenny cheese case, which, um, made quite an appearance at the French hearing in the Supreme Court. Um, if you're interested in the case law on upstream emissions. Um, second, in terms of why it might be helpful to you, additionally, to understand the extent of greenhouse gas emissions from inbound flights, inbound tourism benefits are, uh, assessed and relied on and taken into account as a benefit of the scheme. Um, but the inbound greenhouse gas emissions, if they're not, even if no information is even being given to the examining authority about them, um, one is confronted with the situation where the benefit of the inbound tourism is being taken into account, but none of the pollution impact in greenhouse gas terms, um, is even being explained to the examining authority.

00:25:00:22 - 00:25:03:04

Thank you, Mr. Linus.

00:25:03:17 - 00:25:14:26

Um, Scotland's for the applicant. I think, given that we're taking this issue where I'd explain the rationale, we can pick up any points arising as we as we do, that falls into the broader workstream that we've said will undertake.

00:25:15:07 - 00:25:28:17

Yes. Um, we've got two more speakers and then hopefully they can take account of their comments as well, given time. Yes. Professor Osborne, uh, Dan Osborne for Sussex. Um.

00:25:29:07 - 00:25:30:08

Just a small point.

00:25:30:10 - 00:26:02:20

On the LCA done for sustainable aviation fuel and things of this kind. If the sustainable aviation fuel is brought overseas, how do we handle the, um, supposed carbon savings of a sustainable aviation fuel in that kind of situation? So I think the kind of points that we have, just this case I just made, that kind of thing is relevant. It's a very difficult and subtle argument to get across and hearing some clarification would be really helpful for everybody, I'm sure.

00:26:02:22 - 00:26:04:00

Not least to yourself, sir.

00:26:04:21 - 00:26:06:10

Thank you. Councillor Essex.

00:26:07:15 - 00:27:15:03

Thank you, counsel, on behalf of GAC and just building on the points from Cagney, in the same way, as you know, inbound tourism is considered, but not the pollution impact in terms of the economic benefit. Um, direct, indirect, induced and catalysed jobs impact is considered when looking at the economic benefits. But when we're looking at climate, it appears that we don't even consider, even consider all of the direct event, the direct impacts, because not all the flights are considered, let alone the indirect induced or or catalyzed. And I wonder if that maybe relate to the way in which the EMA guidance, which was quoted on page 24 of that guidance, is interpreted in the sense that to what extent is the overall economic impact, um, that that this investment is driving in terms of climate change, is it reducing emissions or is it increasing emissions? So, for example, if a flight goes to a small island state that's at threat of climate change and it builds small hotels, which has embodied carbon construction, impact becomes more reliant on high carbon flights for their economy, and then uses that revenue to build a seawall to stop themselves going under, at least in the short term.

00:27:15:05 - 00:27:39:27

Is that a sustainable model? Is that what Amy was wanting to see happen? And I wonder if if, as the applicant suggests, that they don't consider sector emissions, but look at aviation in an economy wide basis, then they should also look at the climate impacts on an economy wide basis and consider the indirect inducing and catalytic impacts as well as the direct ones, albeit they're not considering all the indirect ones in the the approach that they're proposing.

00:27:40:21 - 00:27:45:04

Thank you. Mr. Lyons, can you pick those points up in writing, essentially.

00:27:45:12 - 00:27:48:26

Uh, Scott Lynott for the applicant. Uh, yeah. So they cover the same broad area. Yeah.

00:27:49:09 - 00:28:22:24

Okay. Thank you. So let's move on then to the other headings under Aviation Emissions. I think we've certainly discussed alternative fuels and nascent technology this morning to some degree. If we had more time possibly go into it in more detail. But I think we're certainly aware of the points that have been raised. So don't intend to ask any further questions. Now I need to ask more. I'll put those in writing, um, greenhouse gas emissions trading and offsetting.

00:28:23:15 - 00:28:25:16

I'm just seeing my own notes before we.

00:28:48:29 - 00:28:53:29

Um. So. The applicants stated that.

00:28:55:22 - 00:29:29:17

The Carbon Action Plan commits Gatwick to a transition through carbon neutrality towards net zero and absolute zero over time. Firstly, what is the time period for that? And then how can the applicant guarantee these objectives would be met? So anything further to say beyond what you've already said on that? Then the final part of this is what is the applicant's response to East Sussex County Council's request.

00:29:30:03 - 00:29:45:19

At Rep 139 that Gatwick Airport should specifically state which offsets scheme they intend to use so that research can be conducted into the robustness of the scheme.

00:29:58:07 - 00:29:59:06

I can get more.

00:29:59:18 - 00:30:01:09

Mr. Mark Edwards for the applicant.

00:30:01:27 - 00:30:32:24

Uh, so, uh, let me address the carbon neutral net zero absolute zero trajectory to begin with. Uh, Gatwick has been carbon neutral since 2017. Uh, Gatwick, uh, gets its status accredited through the uh Airport Carbon Accreditation scheme, of which Gatwick has level four plus. Uh, that was the highest level of the scheme until November last year. Uh, so as part of that, that covers uh emissions under Gatwick control, scope one and two as well as, uh, business travel.

00:30:33:27 - 00:31:04:10

So we've been carbon neutral since 2017. Uh, the commitment in the cap is again covering, uh, gal scope one and two to be net zero by 2030. This entails a reduction in carbon emissions, with any residuals being removed using the use of removal offsets as opposed to reduction offsets. The cap then further commits to being absolute zero again for scope one and two.

00:31:04:18 - 00:31:08:28

Uh, by 2040 and absolute zero, there will be no offsets.

00:31:10:24 - 00:31:55:06

Uh, in terms of the quality of offsets as part of the ACA scheme, uh, there is an offsetting guidance which is publicly available from the ACA, which sets out, uh, specific criteria and schemes, uh, with which specify the offsets which can be used to qualify. Those offsets which we buy are accredited and verified by the ACA on an annual basis. Furthermore, in our 2023, uh, Decade of Change performance summary, we provided a, an offsetting statement, uh, which gave full details of our offsetting strategy as well as the offsets that we bought to cover the 2023 emissions.

00:31:55:24 - 00:32:16:05

In terms of trajectory, uh, we are by 2030, we will only be using removal offsets for residuals. And we have already started the transition from removal, sorry, from reduction to removal offsets. So for 2023, we purchased 25% removal uh offset and 75% reduction offsets.

00:32:17:10 - 00:32:18:00

Okay. Thank you.

00:32:18:29 - 00:32:52:19

Um, so Scotland asked the applicant. One other part of your question was about guaranteeing the delivery of these of these commitments. Perhaps I can summarize that. Um, you've heard what the, uh, a big, uh, commitment, um, is the success of tightening between 2030 and 2040, where it's effectively zero, no emissions attributable to actors operations in 2040. But the force mechanism

generally, uh, under the cap is that we've got to produce an annual monitoring report to government every year.

00:32:52:21 - 00:33:28:04

That's got to be subject to independent specialist accreditation, uh, including the verification of our footprint and in line with, uh, relevant standards. If that monitoring report either shows a failure or we think we're not on track acting reasonably, we have to prepare an action plan with a timescale within three months of that report, submit a copy of that to, to, uh, to government. And as we've touched upon already, um, government will then be able to take whichever action it wants to require to change the measures that it's undertaking.

00:33:28:14 - 00:34:18:01

We say, um, it's correct that that happens because the action which may be under contemplation, needs to be viewed in the light of emerging practices in the wider aviation sector. There's also a review process every five years. Again, we have to submit that to government. Now, some have commented that there is no provision for approval or consultation, and that's quite deliberate on our part, because it partly reflects the nature of carbon emissions as global to be dealt with at a national level, which is why government is involved and the approach that we take, where we set out outcomes with flexibility, underlying measures that reflects Jet Zero and the ability of the government itself, as we've said before, acknowledges, is having to provide direction and control over decarbonising.

00:34:18:03 - 00:34:51:10

So if you provide the report, government doesn't think we're acting sufficiently in line with its, uh, with its objectives. Um, it can take appropriate steps. And an approval process would simply duplicate what the government could do through emitting its jet zero commitments in any event. So that's why we say we can, uh, essentially, uh, guarantee, um, that these commitments are going to be met because there's a what we regard as an enforcement mechanism in place which allows government to hold us to account.

00:34:52:10 - 00:35:00:17

Okay. Thank you. And then the the final part was which offset scheme you intend to use. Are you able to confirm that?

00:35:03:14 - 00:35:03:29

Mark.

00:35:04:02 - 00:35:18:27

Mark Edwards, on behalf of the applicant, um, in order to maintain our ACA accreditation, we are only able to use offsets which, uh, fall under the jurisdiction of that, uh, scheme, which, as I said, are assessed annually by the ACA.

00:35:19:23 - 00:35:20:16

Okay. Thank you.

00:35:42:18 - 00:35:51:28

Okay. I think, um, let's move on to, uh, the issue of non-carbon dioxide impacts.

00:35:54:25 - 00:36:33:25

So just. Sorry, Michael. Just before you do that, could I just ask? Not for an answer now, but in the post, hearing submissions that follow at the, um, deadline for just in relation to that last point about the accreditation schemes, could it be identified to the authorities, um, which particular provision of the ACA accreditation precludes the use of other schemes? I understand what was being said, which was that we can only use, uh, ACA schemes if we want to maintain our accreditation.

00:36:34:09 - 00:37:15:02

Uh, and I understand the point, but I quite like to see that articulated as to why there is or where there is a prohibition on using other schemes in conjunction with an ACA approved scheme. I can understand there's a difference between you can't substitute, you have to use an ACA scheme, but whether it's a you cannot supplement. That's what I quite like to see because that's I think the issue, the local authorities feel that there may be some local schemes which would be of value, and if they're being told they can't be utilised, I think we'd like to see a clearer reason as to why they can't be utilised.

00:37:15:04 - 00:37:18:19

Okay. Thank you. Is that can that be picked up at deadline for.

00:37:19:01 - 00:37:50:14

Uh, Mark Edwards for the applicant? Yes, it can, but I'd like to make a clarification, if I may. Um, it's the ACA. There are various offsetting schemes, such as Gold Standard and VCM. There is not an ACA offsetting scheme, and it's the, uh, the ACA stipulates which schemes can be used. Uh, so if we were to, uh, we could purchase additional offsets that are outside, we would then be purchasing more than 100% of offsets than we would need to be. And equally, we are also looking at the development of a local project.

00:37:50:16 - 00:37:55:21

And as part of that, we would look to get it certified by a body identified by ACA.

00:37:56:19 - 00:37:57:12

Okay. Thank you.

00:38:00:12 - 00:38:05:25

Okay. So if we move on to non CO2 impacts, um,

00:38:07:10 - 00:38:17:21

the applicant appears to be excluding non CO2 impacts from the assessments on the basis of the difficulty in accurately measuring or quantifying them.

00:38:19:09 - 00:38:56:24

In this context, it's helpful to note that in Jay Z. S one year on, the government has stated that it is pressing ahead with research projects into aviation's non Cl2 impacts, thereby recognizing the importance of this issue. Could the applicant comment on the multiplier suggested by Afw and Bristol Airport Action Network in their relevant reps and answer Y and non CO2 assessment hasn't been provided, at least give an indication of the scale of the impact

00:38:58:12 - 00:38:58:27

Scotland has.

00:38:59:16 - 00:39:02:06

Mr. Robertson to explain why that's not been included.

00:39:04:29 - 00:39:37:14

Keith Robertson for the applicant. Um, yes. As. As uh noted, there is a multiplier that is provided for the purposes of corporate emissions reporting. Um, the the purpose of that is to allow organizations who are measuring their own corporate impact to attach more weight to aviation when they when they're looking at what their response is to, to, to managing their own carbon emissions.

00:39:38:01 - 00:40:07:07

Um, that's the that's the purpose of that multiplier. It is acknowledged that that is not founded. That number is not founded in a consistent scientific understanding. It is there as a mechanism for them to attach more weight to it, but it does not represent the actual impact, because the science on that is still unclear. So rather than use a multiplier that we know to be inaccurate, we have we have emitted it from the, uh, from the EAS.

00:40:08:20 - 00:40:16:13

So you've decided not to give any figure because giving any figure would be inaccurate.

00:40:20:03 - 00:41:01:27

It's Keith Ellison for the applicant. We have we've admitted it because it would be inaccurate. Um, because, as I say, the scientific consensus is there. Uh, there's an additional challenge again, that comes back to contextualization. There is no way in which we can appropriately contextualize that number. So even if we were to apply a multiple to give you to give you a number that that notionally, uh, accounts, albeit inaccurately for that impact, that non CO2 impact is not included within any of the, the, the carbon budgets that we can use for our contextualization.

00:41:01:29 - 00:41:21:06

So again it's. It's I mean, arguably it's a little like the, the. No, I'm not going to draw that parallel. We would we would have a number there and nothing can to contextualize it against an inaccurate number and nothing to contextualize it again. So it seems of limited value in the. Yes.

00:41:22:13 - 00:41:31:12

Yeah. But um, APH has adjusted multiplication factor of 0.7. Um.

00:41:33:12 - 00:41:41:02

Bristol Airport's Action network suggested the multiplier of 1.9, which seems to be based on something that's,

00:41:42:18 - 00:41:49:14

uh, previous Government Department Bayes used. So I accept that there are,

00:41:51:07 - 00:42:16:17

um, question marks over what the multiplier would be. But surely, given the size of non CO2 emissions, it would be helpful to have something, wouldn't it. And again I accept what you can say is you can't contextualize it. So you can't include it within that assessment. But at the moment we've got nothing for what is a major emission.

00:42:17:06 - 00:42:54:04

Um Scotland applicant I think first point, the standard response that there isn't anything reliable that we could use to conduct that, um, assessment. And this issue arose and the Bristol decision, where the panel in that case concluded that along with CO2 emissions, non CO2 effects did have the potential to have, um, bring about climate change, but there is considerable uncertainty as to the effect and longevity. In that case, it had been suggested that a multiplier to take into account non CO2 effects should be used.

00:42:54:06 - 00:43:32:29

But the panel concluded there wasn't any policy as to how any such multiplier should be dealt with, and the panel concluded that um, given the extent of scientific uncertainty, it wouldn't be. It would be not be unreasonable, or it would be unreasonable to weigh that matter in the balance against the proposal. And, um, that decision, um, uh, survived a challenge. So the approach that we're taking, um,

in this case, to say we recognise that, uh, non CO2 effects, um, uh, may be there, but there's no reasonable there's no reasonable way in which we could be expected to include that.

00:43:33:01 - 00:43:48:11

And then in an EIA, we say it's entirely appropriate. And, um, that issue is not cured by fixing on any multiplier for the sake of it and circumstances where there's just sufficient scientific uncertainty to mean that it's not a valuable process.

00:43:49:06 - 00:43:52:24

Okay. We'll park that for now. Thank you. Um, so if.

00:43:52:26 - 00:44:31:06

I could just indicate very quickly, Mr. Aldean, for Cagney on the Bristol airport decision, two things distinguish it. The first is that at the Bristol Airport inquiry, no other specific multiplier had been suggested as credible. And RAAF has suggested a different, credible multiplier. But secondly, and this came out a bit in what Mr. Lyon has just said, um, what the High Court decided was that in the context of that, in that decision making by that panel, they had not come to an irrational conclusion. Um, what it does not suggest is that it would be irrational for this examining authority in this context to take a different approach.

00:44:31:13 - 00:44:32:01

Thank you.

00:44:33:21 - 00:44:36:12

Yeah. Um. Mr. Johnson.

00:44:40:03 - 00:45:15:29

Thank you Tim Johnson for Aviation Environment Federation. I think the previous intervention said more or less what I wanted to say, but I would just call attention to a couple of points. I think the first one is that we need to distinguish between consensus and uncertainty. I think when it comes to consensus, there is a substantial volume of peer reviewed evidence amongst the leading sort of climate atmospheric scientists that tell us that non CO2 impacts are real and that exist and need to be taken into account by policy makers.

00:45:16:06 - 00:45:48:04

I think that message is heard loud and clear by governments. It's why the Jet Zero Council has set up a task and finish group to to work through both the sort of policy mitigation options and to and to sort of expedient that work. Um, and it's also the reason why it offers that advice to um corporates, uh, travellers in terms of how they account for their footprint. So I think the, the consensus I think needs, needs little justification.

00:45:48:06 - 00:46:26:09

Yes, yes. There's uncertainty. The number we put forward, a 0.7 is at the very bottom end of that, that range. Um, if we've been writing the same paper last year, the government figure would have, would have been 0.9. Um, it revised it slightly downwards this year, and I say it comes very much at the bottom end of that spectrum. And then I just think the the other point to, to note is that we say this is very much for, for information. It's to assist the decision making process. Um, it's not a recommendation that, that it is, um, part of the policy if you like.

00:46:26:11 - 00:46:37:08

Um, case of policy test that has to be met. But it would certainly in our, in our opinion, add add weight to the considerations and give a sense of scale. Thank you.

00:46:38:12 - 00:46:46:09

Thank you Mr. Johnson. Uh, Mr. Lyons, can you take those points away and consider them? So it's a deadline for Police Scotland.

00:46:46:21 - 00:46:50:10

In the interest of time. So rather than go through a detailed answer, we'll do that. Thank you.

00:46:50:16 - 00:47:28:29

Thank you. So let's then move on to item nine. We've still got quite a bit to do, but hope to finish by five. Uh, item nine comparison of emissions to UK carbon budgets. I think we've dealt with a fair amount of this already, but one thing I wanted to ask various IPS was the statements being made quoted in their relevant reps, namely, that Gatwick alone would be responsible for over 3 to 5% of the UK's sixth carbon budget, with or without jet zero mitigations.

00:47:31:03 - 00:47:46:08

And emissions attributable to Gatwick would grow from less than 1% of total UK emissions to over 5.5% of the Climate Change Committee's recommended total UK emissions in 2038.

00:47:49:18 - 00:48:12:25

And the forecast would be 2.5 million tons PA higher than in 2018, an increase of nearly 50%. So I understand the 3%, which is we talked about earlier. What I'm not clear about is why that's 3 to 5% figure comes from. So I think this has been raised by um.

00:48:14:14 - 00:48:28:17

Various IPS. I think Councillor Essex, you raised this in your submission as well as Jack and plainly wrong. But if there's you're here, could could you explain further please.

00:48:28:25 - 00:49:16:13

Yeah. Councillor Essex, on behalf of Jack, um, 3 to 5.5% range is based on whether the jitsu assumptions hold true or not. So it's a range as to whether they hold true or they don't hold true. So for example, if staff does or does not get delivered and the other technical assumptions made in the zero dual do not come into account. However, the 3 to 5.5% range does not include the direct carbon emissions we've just discussed, which would increase that number further. Neither does it include the. The incoming as well as the outgoing flights, which, you know, just to distinguish between how the impacts of the carbon, the carbon of this project is monitored once it's finished against the impacts of giving it planning permission as a, you know, a capital infrastructure projects at the start.

00:49:16:15 - 00:49:33:10

So I think if you look at it as a planning decision and at the point of planning, it's the incoming, the outgoing and and the direct emissions, then you could say it's not 3 to 5.5. You need to factor that up by 0.7 to 0.9. And then and then again double it okay.

00:49:33:12 - 00:49:36:27

So precisely where does that 5.5 come from.

00:49:37:23 - 00:49:56:13

So that's comparing the emissions of Gatwick to the level of the carbon budget for the UK in 2038, assuming a continued century on the current basis. That's at the start of the sixth carbon budget, I think, which is when carbon emissions for aviation are required to be considered for the first instance.

00:49:56:15 - 00:49:58:15

Is that calculation in your submission?

00:49:59:25 - 00:50:01:13

I don't think it is, but I can share.

00:50:01:15 - 00:50:12:16

It if it could be shared, please, so that we can see that. And then I think if we have that, then that would be the point. Uh, Mr. Lyons, for you to respond on that, probably.

00:50:12:28 - 00:50:43:19

Uh, Scotland's for the applicant. Yes. Two very, very brief comments that will respond to that in writing. But it appears to, um, do what we say or oughtn't to happen, which is to assume that Jet Zero fails. The second point is just reiterate we we do say that when one is looking under this, um, agenda item, uh, and applying the policy to the project, that one text, not the 3% figure, although we've suggested it's relevant. But our point is one looks at the project figure, which is much lower.

00:50:43:25 - 00:50:44:29

Yes. Okay. Thank you.

00:50:52:09 - 00:51:03:29

I think the other questions I had on that topic can be dealt with in writing. So are there any other? Yes. No. That's fine, thank you. Um.

00:51:08:21 - 00:51:10:18

Let's then move on to

00:51:12:07 - 00:51:14:27

item ten, which is mitigation.

00:51:30:20 - 00:51:52:01

I suppose the basic question here is, are the commitments within the Carbon Action plan clear enough and enforceable? Um, we raised the number of questions, written questions about this, and we've got the applicants response to all of those. And.

00:51:55:01 - 00:51:56:04

There is.

00:51:58:12 - 00:52:15:24

As has already been said today, there is a whole range of different measures with a lack of certainty about how effective any might be to meet the overall. Um.

00:52:18:18 - 00:52:37:12

Requirements of reducing the, uh, effects. So I'm not sure. Can I ask any further questions on. That at this point. But I welcome any other comments people have on the cap at this. Point.

00:52:38:05 - 00:53:01:03

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford, joint local authorities. I take the point very briefly. Um, the way that the cap that's at, uh, 091 is currently formulated is it doesn't have, um, with respect, uh, much by way of sanction. Um, or um.

00:53:03:08 - 00:53:41:06

Other measures in the event that the various commitments are not achieved. And Mr. Linus took you through briefly the process that's outlined in section four on monitoring, governance and review, which does include a reference in some circumstances to government to report outcomes. It doesn't include, as it were, any role for local authorities, um, to play a part in that process.

00:53:41:10 - 00:54:02:05

And we regard that as, um, remiss. Um, and if I can just draw to your attention by way of a comparison, um, the surface access commitments have been modified in rep 3029.

00:54:03:28 - 00:54:58:21

That deadline three. Uh, you will be aware that they already included a role for a forum to play its part in monitoring and reviewing commitments, but what the applicant has done in the surface access commitments is to progress that further forward, so that in the event of effectively a dispute or disagreement between the applicant and the forum about the efficacy of measures or what mitigation measures might be appropriate to supplement the identified commitments, the applicant is now proposing to escalate such disputes to the Secretary of State through a further plan, with the Secretary of State having an ability to impose mitigation measures on the applicant to deliver on the surface access commitments, particularly in relation to Mod share.

00:54:59:05 - 00:55:31:04

Now appreciate that. They're slightly different issues that they're dealing with, but certainly in terms of giving teeth to the carbon action plan, we would suggest that there needs at the very least to be something which mirrors the approach in the latest iteration of the surface access commitments. But we certainly think there needs to be a role for the local authorities in that process. We can understand that there's in a sense, there's a live debate as to who should have the final say so. And we can see, given the.

00:55:32:20 - 00:55:52:25

National and global nature of carbon that there may be a reason for saying, well, the final arbiter should be the Secretary of state rather than individual relevant planning authorities. But nonetheless, we make the point quite strongly that at the moment, the cap we don't think has the teeth that it really needs to deliver on its outcomes. Thank you.

00:55:54:11 - 00:55:56:09

Mr. Linus. To respond on teeth.

00:55:56:11 - 00:56:32:13

Yes, Scott Linus, for the applicant, there's a very clear rationale behind the distinction being drawn between the cap and the and the SA. C um, the the air sacs have been drafted the way they are to involve more local involvement, uh, to more local, um, contributions because, um, the impacts that they're dealing with are primarily felt at a local level. The cap has a different conceptual basis that one is looking at global emissions, which are controlled at the national level, and it's entirely appropriate.

00:56:32:15 - 00:57:04:20

The secretary of state is the primary body that considers whether or not Gatwick is meeting its, uh, its obligations. That's quite clear across not just aviation emissions, but a vehicle emissions which fall within the scope of, uh, of jet zero. So it's entirely coherent for the enforcement mechanism under the cap to be the secretary of state. Whereas under the air SACs, we recognise there is a rule out there at a local level, get it to transport and to some extent air quality. Uh, that's being is being affected.

00:57:04:22 - 00:57:44:08

So we don't accept the point that just because there's a rule provided for local authorities and the SOC, that automatically means you must translate it into the, uh, into the cap and exactly and exactly the same way. Um, as for the question of teeth, um, as I've explained, um, already, if we report to government, uh, on how we are achieving against the outcomes that have been identified within, um, within the, the cap, uh, government, as we have found out through its relation to sustainable aviation fuels, has a range of measures open to it and it can respond as it sees fit.

00:57:44:10 - 00:58:01:25

So rather than having new taste, the cap is designed on the basis that the Secretary of State will be able to step in and tell the airport to do what the Secretary of State thinks is necessary. So it's quite the opposite of there being no teeth. We provide for the Secretary of State to tell us what to do is not satisfied that we're doing enough.

00:58:02:08 - 00:58:13:27

But when you report to the Secretary of State under the cap, couldn't that report incorporate what the local authorities would like the Secretary of State to hear?

00:58:15:01 - 00:58:53:18

And was Scott Leonard for the applicant? The Cap is designed for us to be telling the Secretary of State how the outcomes that we've committed to, using the measures that we have identified as possible, are achieving our aims. As I said, this is a this is a global emissions which have relevance at a national level. And whilst we accept the local involvement on matters such as transport and and air quality, we we don't see the same rule being provided for at a local level so that councils have their, uh, their input in the same way as we provided for under the SACs.

00:58:54:08 - 00:58:54:23

Okay.

00:58:55:14 - 00:58:57:06

Mr. Bedford, do you want to come back on that?

00:58:58:14 - 00:59:38:15

So, uh, you will know that many local authorities have declared climate emergencies precisely because there is a local dimension to climate, as well as it being a global and a national problem. And so I say I can accept that there may be, um, a legitimate discussion about who should be the final arbiter, but that doesn't, to my mind, provide an answer that says that therefore, the local authorities should have no role and no involvement. And the second point is that you will notice that the teeth, uh, in the sac are rather more, um, precise than any suggestion that there are teeth in the cap.

00:59:38:17 - 00:59:40:16

So I leave those two different points with you.

00:59:41:16 - 01:00:08:00

Um, Scotland's for the applicant, two very brief points. Ultimately, it's the Secretary of State who's a responsible authority here. That's entirely justifies the approach taken under the cap. Secondly, we are we have to publish, uh, our monitoring reports. And for whatever reason, the councils think there is anything which, uh, requires them to make any submissions to the secretary of state they can't do. That doesn't mean that we have to build in some formal consultation process and that they can.

01:00:11:08 - 01:00:15:06

Okay. Thank you. Any other comments on mitigation?

01:00:16:24 - 01:00:30:16

Has been dealt with fairly briefly, but we will pick up more issues. Sure. During the written questions. Okay. Thank you. So then. Oh, sorry. Uh, yes.

01:00:31:18 - 01:01:06:07

Just just very, very quickly. It seems to me that there's a risk here of, um, ping pong, if you like, between Secretary of State and Aviation. Gatwick in this particular case. So that, um, if it were the

case that, uh, emissions, shall we say, were overrunning for any reason, uh, then the sector will be looking to the Secretary of State to solve the issue by proposing some measure. Undefined. Um, that would mean there will be a delay in the measure coming in and being effective in reducing emissions.

01:01:06:12 - 01:01:27:12

That means this overreliance on the Secretary of State taking action, rather than the sector taking action in a timely way, would mean there's much more chance of not meeting net zero. So I'm not sure that this reliance on the Secretary of State taking action is, is really very, very sound. Okay. Thank you.

01:01:28:19 - 01:01:54:16

Scott liners for the applicant. Um, when one looks at the cap, one can see that provision is made there for us to actually report in circumstances where we don't think we're on track. So there's an anticipatory element, um, uh, to the cap already. And in any event, the reporting has to be done on an annual basis. Um, so that, um, any issues that we do foresee arising have to be reported in a timely manner so we don't accept the point.

01:01:55:13 - 01:01:56:05

Okay. Thank you.

01:01:59:23 - 01:02:05:08

So let's then move on to the final. Oh, sorry. Councillor. Essex.

01:02:05:22 - 01:02:41:18

Sorry. Very briefly. Um, we talked earlier about how there is the assumptions that the jets will be delivered, and we've talked at length about that on the aviation side. But I think on the other side about the, the, the highway impacts, there's also an assumption that the, the transport decarbonisation, um, high ambition won't be delivered, particularly in light of the carbon budget delivery plan which was published subsequently, which removed a lot of the demand reduction measures, um, from a top down level from the government and relies mainly on electrification and technical solutions in the very much similar way that Sarah does.

01:02:41:20 - 01:03:13:07

And and in a paper that we referenced in our submission from GAC, it basically says, well, it's down to the local councils through their local transport plans to deliver that, that um, demand in transport instead. But if Gatwick in its investment in expanding the SRN, um, it could potentially backfire. The expansion of the SRN could actually depress and and, um, frustrate measures at the local level to actually reduce journeys.

01:03:13:11 - 01:03:31:22

Um, if at the same time as um, trying to reduce demand, we expand road capacity. Um, I think there's a problem there. I'm not sure how it's remedied. Um, because at the moment the surface access commitments don't really address it. And the carbon action plan excludes surface transport emissions as well as the aviation emissions.

01:03:32:18 - 01:03:33:03

Thank you.

01:03:34:10 - 01:03:38:13

Mr. Lyons, can you pick that up in writing? Is that okay? Thank you.

01:03:40:01 - 01:03:46:00

Um, right. Item 11 cumulative effects.

01:04:06:02 - 01:04:23:20

Um, there are some detailed questions which you can come back to in writing, but just picking up one of the issues that was raised by a number of local authorities, um, and others, I think, and this was.

01:04:25:18 - 01:04:39:02

That the UK's eight biggest airports plan to increase. By over 150 million more passengers a year by 2050, relative to 2019 levels.

01:04:42:28 - 01:04:47:07

Has that been taken account of? And if not, why not?

01:04:49:01 - 01:04:52:08

Uh, Scott Linus for the applicant. Um.

01:04:56:14 - 01:05:30:12

I need to make a couple of introductory points on this so the answer is clear. Generally, the adequacy of the assessment of significant effects, including the basis upon which cumulative assessment is undertaken as a matter of judgment for the decision maker and the assessment of significance of carbon emissions, we say, is appropriately carried out against UK national carbon budgets. We say that recent decisions confirm that is permissible for the decision maker to look at the scale of carbon emissions relevant relative to a national target.

01:05:30:14 - 01:06:20:16

That's the first point. Other decisions have rejected the proposition that accumulative assessment must consider other specific projects or groups of projects in the context of greenhouse gas emissions, as appropriate for a project emissions alone to be compared to the national carbon budgets, with no need to perform any bespoke cumulative assessment with other projects and as previous decisions have recognised, the reason for that is explained in the EMA guidance that the effects of GHG emissions from specific cumulative projects should not be individually assessed, or there is no basis for selecting any particular one for the other, and there's no scientific rationale for the selection of a particular collection of schemes for comparison against a national target.

01:06:20:25 - 01:06:54:06

And we say that applies in the absence of sectoral and at targets as a matter of law. And just as there isn't a scientific rationale for selecting a particular collection of schemes for comparison against the national target, we said the same approach should apply to sectoral assessment based on the inclusion of several projects. So essentially a lieu um. Uh, we've we've done the assessment of the project against the national Covid budgets that is adequate to amount to a cumulative assessment, um, uh, given the previous decisions.

01:06:54:08 - 01:07:27:01

All that said, it's correct to note that previous decisions have recognised how EMA guidance anticipates the possibility of general sector based contextualisation. So there's no sector bound to target. But insofar as the guidance suggests that a broad sectoral approach to contextualisation may be appropriate. That's what we've done. And we say that's sufficient to act as a cumulative assessment. So we don't need fundamentally to work out the assessments of all our support schemes coming through in the sector and apply that to the national budget.

01:07:27:19 - 01:07:45:24

Previous decisions have recognised that because of the nature of the carbon budget itself, given that it's an accumulation of all projects within the wider economy, comparing the project against that is

sufficient effectively to amount to a cumulative assessment and subject to what the and the guidance says, we don't need to go any further than that.

01:07:46:27 - 01:07:47:15

Thank you.

01:07:48:21 - 01:07:53:11

Does anyone wish to comment on cumulative effects?

01:07:56:06 - 01:08:38:05

It's a very briefly Michael Bedford a joint local authorities. We don't take issue with the position where you are dealing with a circumstance where there is no sectoral. Uh, target and we know what the case law, which is looked at highway projects has said on that. But we do think that in the circumstance where you do have, uh, what is a sectoral target, whether it's described as an interim target is besides the point jet zero strategy does set out a sectoral target, uh, for aviation.

01:08:38:10 - 01:08:50:14

And it is therefore relevant, we would suggest, when you are contextualizing how this project fares against that trajectory, to understand what proportion.

01:08:52:25 - 01:09:00:25

Of that trajectory is accounted for by this project in the context of what is also known about other projects.

01:09:04:13 - 01:09:27:29

So we would suggest that whilst it's not a matter of legal requirement, it's certainly a matter of appropriate assessment in terms of informing the examining authority of the context of the emissions of this proposal, to put those emissions in the context of other known projects, which will also be going to the same sectoral target.

01:09:28:19 - 01:09:30:19

Thank you, Mr. Scott.

01:09:30:28 - 01:10:07:06

The applicant appear to be two separate points being made there. And insofar as is being suggested in response to the question that you put that, one has to look at, um, net zero as an entirety and compare that against national budgets. We say that's not necessary because government has already said that, um, it's confident that it can deliver aviation, um, uh, development without compromising jet uh, jet zero policies. But secondly, as far as the point then moves to contextualization exercise where one looks at the project in the context of uh, of jet zero.

01:10:07:14 - 01:10:22:05

Uh, we say that we have done that consistent with the IMF, uh, guidance, um, uh, and demonstrated that, um, uh, Gatwick is entirely consistent with using jet zero as a, as a benchmark.

01:10:24:22 - 01:10:25:15

Okay. Thank you.

01:10:26:14 - 01:10:30:12

Any other comments on cumulative effects? No.

01:10:32:29 - 01:10:40:21

Okay, so on that point, I'll now pass on to Mr. Humphrey to detail any action points arising from the hearing.

01:10:41:19 - 01:10:44:22

Thank you, Mr. Gleason. I have a total of 17.

01:10:44:24 - 01:11:05:00

Action points, mostly for the applicant, some for the joint local authorities, one for Cagney, one for councilor six, and in part for National Highways. Rather than go through them all now. And I have to agree them all with Mr. Gleason. Uh, what I suggest is we publish them as soon as possible, and we have that conversation after this hearing, if that's acceptable.

01:11:06:24 - 01:11:08:12

Scotland of South Africans. Yes.

01:11:10:11 - 01:11:18:18

Thank you. So with that, I'll pass back to Mr. Hockley, Mr. Leeson or you, Mr. Hockley?

01:11:20:24 - 01:11:21:09

Yeah.

01:11:21:22 - 01:11:26:21

Okay. Um, it's for me to finish off, then. Sorry.

01:11:28:14 - 01:11:28:29

Um.

01:11:30:21 - 01:12:14:16

Is there any other business owner wishes to raise before we close the meeting? No. Okay. Thank you. So moving on to item 14. Closure of the meeting. Can I remind people that the timetable for this examination requires that parties provide any post hearing documentation on or before deadline for which is Wednesday the 15th of May? And can I also remind people that the recording of the hearing will be placed on the inspectors website as soon as practicable after this meeting? So I'd just like to finish by thanking everyone for attending the meeting today for those participating.

01:12:15:05 - 01:12:36:09

Um, it's been a very long day and a lot of technical matters have been considered, but I'd like to thank everyone for their contributions and no doubt see lots of you tomorrow. So the time is now three minutes to five. Um, and this issue specific hearing six is now closed. Thank you very much.