No.	Sub.no.	Clarification Question	Date received	Status of Response	Response Issued	Date responded	Supplementary Clarification Question	Date received	Status of response	Response Issued	Date responded	Second Supplementary Clarification Question	Date received	Status of response	Response Issued	Date responded
1		Terms of service for BAP as independent noise advisers to London Luton Airport Ltd Please provide the documents appointing BAP as independent noise advisers to LLAOL and setting out terms of reference / terms of service / scope of work etc, and all subsequent amendments, including the terms and scope of services provided in relation to Application 21/00031/VARCON.	17/06/2022	Responded	Please find attached Schedule 1 to the Agreement between London Luton Airport Operations Limited and Bickerdike Allen Partners LLP for Consultancy Services Dated 20th December 2017 which sets out the scope of services to be provided by BAP to LLAOL (Attachment 1). BAP's role for the Application has been to prepare the noise contour assessments and dwelling and population assessments. The outputs of these assessments can be seen at Appendix 8C of the submitted ES Addendum (January 2021) (see Attachment 2 for Chapter 8 including appendices).	05/06/2022		Our original request covered the material period Dec 2013 to date of growth towards 18mppa. The Agreement which you have provided applies from Dec 2017 only. **Please provide the Agreement(s) in force during the period between Dec 2013 and Dec 2017 so that the role and responsibilities of BAP during that period are also clear.**	13/07/2022	Responded	The request relates to instructions relevant to 21/00031/VARCON which have been provided in our response dated 5 July 2022. The scope of services which were in place between December 2013 and 2017 are not relevant to the information relied upon in the Application (21/00031/VARCON) and so it is not considered necessary to provide for the purposes of the Inquiry. If you disagree, please provide justification for the 2013-2017 request and its relevance to 21/00031/VARCON.	26/07/2022		The 17th June request actually stated "including the terms and conditions of services provided in relation to Application 21/00031/VARCON." As you know, 21/00031/VARCON is a Section 73 application to vary conditions attached to a 2013 planning agreement granted in 2014 (see ES Addendum 1.1.2) where the current ES and its Addendum are read in the light of the 2012 ES (see ES Addendum 1.4.2). The Noise Contouring Methodology A11060-N67-DR in the ES Addendum Figures and Appendices is a Bickerdike Allen report which in section 1.0 confirms its antecedents in the 2012 ES both in methodological terms and in the preparation of contours. Furthermore, Bickerdike Allen undertook the 2015 recalibration of the noise contour model, which carries forward into the current contours. The scope of services provided by Bickerdike Allen since 2012 are therefore entirely relevant throughout the period from the original permission decision in December 2013 (and arguably from the period in 2011/12 when the 2012 ES was being prepared), and that is why we have asked you to provide the applicable ToRs in force for that entire period.	27/07/2022	Responded	During the period pre-2017 there was not a single appointment but many. Furthermore, it would be extremely time consuming to extract them. In any event, we maintain that the pre-2017 scope of service are not relevant to the Inquiry.	18/08/2022
2		Information routinely provided to BAP and anything additional provided for this project Please describe what noise and track data and operational information is routinely provided to BAP (or obtained by BAP directly from airlines) to enable BAP to fulfil its role under item (1); and what (if any) additional data and operational information was provided to BAP for its work on this Application.	17/06/2022	Responded	The Applicant routinely provides the following information to BAP:Every quarter: actual movements for quarter and actual noise monitoring for quarter; •Any additional monitoring information required; and • Forecast 92-day summer period movement data. Typically the data includes movement data (all aircraft) and noise monitoring data. Summaries of the data are provided within the Airport Quarterly Monitoring Reports (QMRs) which are published on the Airport's website at: Quarterly Noise Report	London Luton Airport (london-luton.co.uk). As part of its ongoing role, BAP is sent radar data periodically to allow it to validate the contour model to ensure it best reflects the noise footprint of the airport. This improves the accuracy of the data. Track data is not routinely sought or used. Typically the data includes movement data (all aircraft) and noise monitoring data. Summaries of the data are provided within the Airport Quarterly Monitoring Reports (QMRs) which are published on the Airport's website at: Quarterly Noise Report	London Luton Airport (london-luton.co.uk). As part of its ongoing role, BAP is sent radar data periodically to allow it to validate the contour model to ensure it best reflects the noise footprint of the airport. This improves the accuracy of the data. Track data is not routinely sought or used. No additional information beyond that referenced within this response has been provided to BAP in respect of the Application.	05/06/2022		To clarify terminology, we had referred to the data contained in radar files as "track data", which belongs to NATS and cannot be shared. **Please provide the complete set of radar data files sent to BAP for the period Jan 2014 to date. Please provide the complete set of radar data files provided to BAP for one of the periods prior to Mar 2020 (ie unaffected by the pandemic), and additionally the radar files for the month of September 2019 since they shed light on one of the noisiest periods.**	13/07/2022	Responded	2. The radar data is provided to LLAOL under a commercial contract between LLAOL and NATS. The data belongs to NATS and cannot be shared.	27/07/2022	Responded	In 'Updated ES Chapter 8 - Noise (January 2021).PDF' section 8D1, Table 4.1, PDF p79, in response to a question by Vernon Cole asking why the radar data had not been used, Woods states "The modelled departure track centrelines and dispersed sub tracks are based on an analysis of radar data and information provided by the airport." This suggests either that the radar data was in fact shared with and analysed by Bickerdike Allen, since Bickerdike Allen is qualified to perform the modelling and as far as we are aware the Applicant is not; or that the Applicant analysed the radar data in-house and provided to use in the model. Therefore in order that the Inquiry has clear information about the basis upon which this key aspect of the modelling has been done, and how it may have changed over time (noting that the flight tracks changed in 2015 when RNAV was introduced, please provide either the relevant radar data which informed any changes to the model which applied to the contours provided in the ES information being relied on, or full disclosure of the analysis performed by the Applicant which was used to adjust that model, whichever the case may be.	18/08/2022
3		ES ch2 rev Appendix 8C Noise modelling report (BAP document A11060-N67-DR 21 Dec 2020)	17/06/2022	Responded	As a general point to note, the output of the data referenced below is contained within the ES including Ch 8 regarding Noise (January 2021) and the updated version contained in the ES Appendix and an updated version will be provided in the ES Addendum (July 2022).	05/06/2022											
	a	Please provide the flight-by-flight noise data from each of the fixed noise monitors referred to in section 5 for all years from 2011 to 2019. Each flight record would be expected to include the date, time, aircraft operator, runway, arrival or departure, flight number, aircraft type, noise data as Lamax and SEL, altitude corresponding to noise data, and airport of origin/destination.	17/06/2022	Responded	It should be noted that the relevant data are provided to BAP in respect of the Application were 2018 and 2019. The 'look back' of one year is an approach that is in accordance with industry standards. The years 2011-2017 therefore extend beyond the period of assessment in the ES Addendum (January 2021). For this reason, the Applicant will be responding to this request by providing data in respect of the years 2018 and 2019 only on the basis that data pre-2018 is considered to not be relevant to the Application and the matters to be considered at the Inquiry. The data for 2018 and 2019 will follow under separate cover by close of business on 7 July (Attachment 3 – to follow). It should also be noted that the raw data provided by the Airport was reviewed by BAP prior to use to remove anomalous entries such as overly long duration measurements or duplicate events. Summaries of the data are provided within the Airport Quarterly Monitoring Reports (QMRs) which are published on the Airport's website at: Quarterin the ES information being relied on, or full disclosure of the analysis performed by the Applicant which was used to adjust that model, whichever the case may be.contou	05/06/2022		The years 2014-2017 are relevant to the Inquiry since BAP report A11060-N67-DR in latest ES-Addendum-Figures&Appendices-Rev1 confirms in 5.0: "Measured noise levels for each rival and departure noise levels for the A320ceo, the most common type, over the period 2014-2018. The highest arrival noise levels occurred in 2018, the highest departure noise levels occurred in 2014. To allow for this variation in noise level, for all the future scenarios the modelled noise level for the A320ceo on departure has been increased to the 2014 level, which is 0.7 dB higher than that in 2018. The arrival noise levels have not been altered." **Please provide the annual noise data files which were sent to BAP, in the same format as those already supplied, for 2014-2017 inclusive.**	13/07/2022	Responded	As requested, the A320ceo data for 2014-2017 is provided here: [data attached]. 2018 has already been provided.	26/07/2022		This 2014-2017 dataset, along with the dataset provided earlier for the 2015 South Luton modelling, does not contain any altitude information. Clearly, altitude is an important aspect of interpreting noise measurements. Please re-provide both the 2015 South Luton dataset and the 2014-2017 dataset complete with altitude information as soon as possible. This parameter, as you know, was one of those listed in our original request of 17th June.	27/07/2022	Responded	Pre 2017 the altitude information was not available in the noise and track system for report hence why it has not been provided. When conducting the validation process for the noise input measurements the altitude is not taken into consideration as the important element is the noise the aircraft makes and recorded at the noise monitoring terminals. as mentioned the filters used to identify erroneous data points are the distance from the monitor and the duration of the noise input.	18/08/2022
	b	Please provide the worksheets and results of the validation exercises conducted by BAP as referred to in section 5 for each of the years for which the exercise was conducted.	17/06/2022	Responded	As set out above, the data above will be provided by 7 July. The worksheets are designed for internal use by BAP to support the preparation of the reports but the Applicant is not in a position to share them as it does not own the necessary rights (e.g. intellectual property) in them	05/06/2022											
	c	Please provide the flight-by-flight noise data for the monitoring in southern Luton referred to in section 4.3 for all periods in which it was conducted and used to modify flight profiles. Each flight record would be expected to include the date, time, aircraft operator, runway, arrival or departure, flight number, aircraft type, noise data as LAmax and SEL for the relevant fixed monitor(s), altitude corresponding to noise data, and airport of origin/destination.	17/06/2022	Responded	This data forms part of the data that will be provided in response to 3(a) above.	05/06/2022											
	d	Please provide details of the information discussed with airlines referred to in section 4.3 relating to the operational procedures flown by Airbus A319, Airbus A320 and Boeing B737-800 types, and indicate in more detail how this information was used to adjust the INM model.	17/06/2022	Responded	This information cannot be provided as it relates to discussions between BAP and the airlines and is commercially sensitive.	05/06/2022		The information requested is relevant to the Inquiry since BAP report A11060-N67-DR states in 4.3: "Following long term measurement of aircraft departures in southern Luton and discussion with airlines the standard flight profiles were supplemented with custom profiles for the Airbus A319 and A320 and the Boeing 737-800." **We suggest a without prejudice discussion to explore what can be evidenced and how regarding profiles. In any case, please supply all data provided to BAP in addition to the 2016 noise data already sent, relevant to "long term measurement of aircraft departures in southern Luton" (ES Addendum Figs&Appendices Rev 1 July2022).**	13/07/2022	Responded	As set out in our previous response dated 5 July 2022, this information cannot be provided as it relates to discussions between BAP and the airlines and is commercially sensitive.	26/07/2022		We question why the flight profiles of aircraft departing Luton Airport should be commercially sensitive, bearing in mind that this does have an effect on the perceived loudness of those aircraft, and that this application seeks to vary noise-controlling conditions, and in light of previous public assertions made by the Applicant about its noise mitigation endeavours including climb rates, and its current commitment to conduct a NADP trial. Leaving that aside for now, our 17th June request included "and indicate in more detail how the information was used to adjust the INM model". Please provide this information. For example, the 2012 ES included a table of multipliers set to calibrate the model predictions against ground noise measurements. It is of obvious relevance to the Inquiry to obtain a clear picture of how the model which generates the very noise contours it is considering has been calibrated and validated, and how faithfully that tallies with available information about the performance of the aircraft in the real world, and that is the information we seek – including clarity, for example, on what information was sought by Bickerdike Allen from airlines but not provided, and how often this information has been updated.	18/08/2022	Responded	When the measured results from the noise monitoring in south Luton became available, we compared them to what the modelling predicted at that location. This found the measured levels were lower than the predicted levels. To investigate this, we decided to seek operational information from the airlines on how they operated. BAP drafted a data request which LLAOL sent to the airlines. The details the airlines provided were then fed into the modelling, and these provided better agreement with the measured results and so were used going forward. The operational information includes departure weights and thrust settings. These affect the economics of operating the flight, for example in relation to fuel use, so if an airline has developed a more efficient procedure, they will not want to share it with a competitor by making it public.	18/08/2022
	e	Please provide the worksheets used to derive the noise averages for the A321ceo and A321neo from the 2018 flight data (above), along with any other information used to derive the "All other" entries shown in Table 3 in section 4.9.	17/06/2022	Responded	As set out above, the data above will be provided by 7 July. The worksheets are designed for internal use by BAP to support the preparation of the reports but the Applicant is not in a position to share them as it does not own the necessary rights (e.g. intellectual property) in them	05/06/2022											
4		Copy of BAP report "A8501-R06C-JGC-DC"	21/06/2022	Responded	The Applicant can find a copy of this document in draft form (Attachment 5). It should be noted, though, that this document is not directly relevant to the Application as it was prepared as a discussion document relating to the Airport's initial proposal to vary condition 12 whilst remaining within the 18mppa passenger cap.	26/07/2022											
5		Please provide the BAP reports cited in the 19/00428/EIA, the original application to increase noise contours, for context: 19_00428_EIA-Regulation_25_Attachment_Code_German_Memo_-_817890.pdf refers on p12 to BAP Report A8501-R06D-JGC, July 2017 VOLUME_3_APPENDIX_7A__NOISE_CONTOUR_AREA_ASSESSMENT_-_828023.pdf refers at the end to BAP Report A11060-N35-DR, July 2019	13/07/2022	Responded	Please see enclosed with this response. Please note that these documents were prepared for the earlier, withdrawn application. A8501-R06D-JGC-DC was issued in draft only for discussion purposes.	26/07/2022											
6		An update today would be much appreciated, along with a confirmation of when the further information will be provided, and your thoughts on how best to confirm that contents of the disclosed data are "Common Ground" – or whether we should just place it all on the Gately & Hamer portal?	22/07/2022	Responded	Response issued to PINS (Joanna Vincent): I have now had an opportunity to discuss with the Applicant the inclusion of the raw data within the Core Documents library. To the extent LADACAN or its expert witnesses consider it necessary to refer to the raw data within their evidence, it would, in our view, be more appropriate for those data sets to be appended to the relevant LADACAN proof(s) of evidence. It should be noted that the raw data has been supplied to LADACAN for information purposes only and remains the subject of ongoing discussions between the parties. The Applicant considers it is important to ensure that the Core Documents properly fall within that description, ie documents which are agreed to be core to the inquiry's determination and therefore likely to be referred to by more than one party. We do not consider the raw data to fall into this category as things stand. Parties can, of course, append material to which they wish to refer as necessary although again one would hope that all parties seek to ensure that such material that is included is relevant to the issues for determination by the Inspectors.	03/08/2022											
				Responded												
7		In order to correctly interpret the noise monitoring data, we need to agree between us the precise latitude/longitude and height above sea level of the locations of each of the three fixed noise monitors NMT01, NMT02 and NMT03 and also of the mobile monitor in South Luton which was used for the 2015 calibration. Please could you ask the Applicant to confirm that information as soon as possible, and – in the case of the additional monitoring data requested – the precise locations and elevations of any of the additional South Luton monitoring data provided, since these are mobile monitors and are deployed at different location on different occasions.	22/07/2022	Responded	These are provided with this response.	18/08/2022											
8		In order to provide visual representations of the flight track context, and the monitoring locations, it will be useful for the Inquiry to see screen shots taken from the Luton Airport "Travis" online web-based noise and track visualisation tool (appreciating its limitations). I note from the conditions of use that it may be necessary to seek written permission from the Airport Operator for this. Please could you arrange for such permission to be granted?	22/07/2022	Responded	BAP has advised the Applicant that Travis screenshots are not relevant to the production of the noise contours. If LADACAN is still of the view that such screenshots would be useful for the Inquiry, please would it confirm their relevance and how exactly the information is intended to be used at the Inquiry.	18/08/2022											
9		Thank you for providing noise data samples for 2018 and 2019, and the explanatory note A11060-N69-DR. Having reviewed the 2018 data provided in relation to the note we have some queries which ought to be relatively straightforward to resolve. Once settled, this may then enable a Statement of Common Ground to be produced in respect of the data, if felt to be useful. We show in italics below the relevant extracts from A11060-N69-DR with our question beneath each one.	25/07/2022	Responded	See responses to individual questions below.	18/08/2022											
	1	Question 1: sample size "As an example of the processing that BAP undertake, the sections below set out the ways in which the 2018 NMT data was filtered for use in the 2019 validation. It should be noted that in many cases a single correlated noise measurement will be excluded for more than one reason. The overall effect was just over 3% of the 131,745 correlated noise measurements being excluded." Totalling across the three 2018 files provided, we have identified 131,256 noise measurements (65,299 + 35,628 + 30,329) rather than the 131,745 indicated above. Whilst not a major issue, it would be good to ensure we are not misreading the files and missing 489 measurements. Please check and confirm.	25/07/2022	Responded	The raw sample includes 131,256 individual measurements from 2018, as noted by LADACAN, and a further 489 individual results from 2019. The latter are the results for the Airbus A321neo, from 18 January until 1 July, and were included so that a sizeable sample of data for the type was used, as it only commenced operation at Luton at the end of 2018. The use of this data is noted in the second para of section 4.6 of the BAP note A11060-N67-DR which is part of ES4.4.	18/08/2022											
	2	Question 2: BAP filter "As an example of the processing that BAP undertake, the sections below set out the ways in which the 2018 NMT data was filtered for use in the 2019 validation. It should be noted that in many cases a single correlated noise measurement will be excluded for more than one reason. The overall effect was just over 3% of the 131,745 correlated noise measurements being excluded." The filters described are clear, and we have applied these, and as a result the total filtered measurements falls from 131,256 to 127,473 – a drop of 2.9%. Again, this is not a major issue but it would be useful to be able to tally the sample sizes accurately after applying a clearly specified filter. Perhaps BAP's rather higher percentage was calculated after also excluding flights with the wrong NMT? Please confirm. Can we take it that the same BAP filters apply to the 2019 measurements? If not, please indicate what was changed.	25/07/2022	Responded	As detailed in BAP note A11060-N69-DR the filters applied by BAP to the 2018 and 2019 data, during the validation exercise for the ES and ES Addendum, included filtering out noise results which were recorded at an NMT that the flight would not have overflown. This and that the fact that allowing for the 2019 data increases the size of the raw sample may explain the slight difference in the percentage excluded. The same filters as set out in BAP note A11060-N69-DR were applied to the 2017 fixed noise monitor data as the 2018 data. For the earlier data from 2014 to 2016 the filters were the durations and the distances from the noise monitors. For the Dec 2014 – Jan 2015 data from the mobile monitor when it was in south Luton, the filters applied considered the durations and the distances from the noise monitors.	18/08/2022	Please extend questions 2, 3 and 4 of the additional requests 25 July 2022 to include the details of the BAP filtering applied to the 2014-2017 noise measurements, and the 2015 noise measurements, where there is any difference to the already disclosed approach used in 2018.	27/07/2022	Responded	Please refer to the response given in Column F.	18/08/2022				
	3	Question 3: duplicate entries Having applied the BAP filter to the 2018 data, we note there are some 634 entries which have the same ATA/ATD time, the same flight number, the same runway and the same operations direction. However, the TLASmax differs – sometimes by just a few seconds, sometimes by 10 minutes or more. We believe the former to be caused by the TopSonic system identifying more than one correlating peak in the same aircraft transit, and the latter (which appears to occur on Arrivals) to be due to go-arounds. In the former case it would probably be appropriate to select one or other value, in the latter case to use both values. However, numbers are relatively small in the first case. Did BAP make any provision in the first of these cases, and did it retain both values in the second (so that we know what the final sample would comprise of)? Does the same answer apply for the 2019 data?	25/07/2022	Responded	Duplicates were not specifically removed from the data from the fixed noise monitors, although some may have been by one of the other filters. However, for the data from the mobile monitor when placed in south Luton there was a relatively high proportion of them. They were therefore removed except when one of the duplicates was at least 10 dB higher than the other, in which case the higher value event was included, as it was considered likely to relate to the departure event.	18/08/2022	Please extend questions 2, 3 and 4 of the additional requests 25 July 2022 to include the details of the BAP filtering applied to the 2014-2017 noise measurements, and the 2015 noise measurements, where there is any difference to the already disclosed approach used in 2018.	27/07/2022	Responded	Please refer to the response given in Column F.	18/08/2022				
	4	Question 4: other validation Did BAP perform any other data validation before analysis which led to noise measurements or any of their parameters being eliminated or modified? Does the same answer apply for the 2019 data?	25/07/2022	Responded	BAP has confirmed that there are none.	18/08/2022	Please extend questions 2, 3 and 4 of the additional requests 25 July 2022 to include the details of the BAP filtering applied to the 2014-2017 noise measurements, and the 2015 noise measurements, where there is any difference to the already disclosed approach used in 2018.	27/07/2022	Responded	Please refer to the response given in Column F.	18/08/2022				
10		With regard to the raw data proposal in my email below, Joanna Vincent has indicated: 5 Raw Data This should be discussed and agreed between you and the other main parties. Please let me know asap if you wish to have that discussion, since I've not heard any further from you re the suggestion. Otherwise we propose to submit the raw data to Joanna to place on the planning portal as Core Documents (noting that some of the files are due to be updated to add altitude data, and the further outstanding requests).	28/07/2022	Responded	Response drafted by HSF/ issued by Wood to PINS (Joanna Vincent): I have now had an opportunity to discuss with the Applicant the inclusion of the raw data within the Core Documents library. To the extent LADACAN or its expert witnesses consider it necessary to refer to the raw data within their evidence, it would, in our view, be more appropriate for those data sets to be appended to the relevant LADACAN proof(s) of evidence. It should be noted that the raw data has been supplied to LADACAN for information purposes only and remains the subject of ongoing discussions between the parties. The Applicant considers it is important to ensure that the Core Documents properly fall within that description, ie documents which are agreed to be core to the inquiry's determination and therefore likely to be referred to by more than one party. We do not consider the raw data to fall into this category as things stand. Parties can, of course, append material to which they wish to refer as necessary although again one would hope that all parties seek to ensure that such material that is included is relevant to the issues for determination by the Inspectors.	03/08/2022											
				Responded												
11	ES Addendum	GIS files used in the noise assessment: GIS files used in the noise assessment The resolution of the contour maps provided in the ES Addendum 2022 is insufficient to enable the comparison to be made, and it is unhelpful that the maps do not contain corresponding tables of enclosed areas. Bearing in mind the nature of these contours in general is such that the thickness of the lines on a low-resolution map can mask significant contour differences (see C08.21 for an example of this problem). Please provide the updated noise contours from the ES Addendum 2022 in multiple format (layer (shp) and the address database used for calculating the numbers of dwellings affected (typically this would be GIS AddressBase Plus, also in shape file format, but may be another date base and could be provided in csv file format or similar).	02/08/2022	Responded	Please find the shapefiles attached with this response. The second part of the request relates to the database of population and dwelling locations used. BAP purchases this from CACI Ltd and it is copyrighted so we cannot share the data.	09/08/2022											
				Responded												
12	ES Addendum	Flow Tables: Flow tables provide forecast Air Traffic Movements for the modelled future years. However, the column "2028 Current Limit" appears to be missing. Please provide forecast daytime and night-time movements for this category as soon as possible.	02/08/2022	Responded	The July 2022 ES Addendum focused on elements which had changed from the May 2021 ES update. The 2028 Condition 10 Noise Contour forecasts have not changed. The 2023 to 2025 data was updated to take account of the previous exceedances of the Condition 10 short-term noise limits. This was not required for the future Condition 10 limits, as such there was no need to update 2028 Condition 10 forecasts and this information is in the 2021 ES.	09/08/2022											
				Responded												
13	ES Addendum	Calibration multipliers: The 2012 ES included "Attachment C, Validation of INM Prediction" which provides SEL measurements of four key aircraft types at NMT1 in Frogmore, the differences between measurements and standard INM assumptions, and movement multipliers to account for the differences. Whilst the various 2021/22 ES documents and Reg 25 responses provide information about noise level adjustments for different aircraft types, we cannot locate any information on the multipliers used in the INM model. Please let us know where this information can be found, or provide a similar note to that given in 2012 detailing the INM multipliers used for the 2021/22 ES.	02/08/2022	Responded	Note A11060 N67 DR_2.0 which is shared with this response provides a summary of the methodology for the latest noise contours.	09/08/2022											
				Responded												
14	ES Addendum	Noise measurement validation The ES document entitled "21_00031_VARCON-Clarification_response_on_noise_issues-954125.pdf" refers to a 2019 validation using data from 2018 and 2019 to ensure contour consistency. Since it is known that at Luton the fixed noise monitors do go out of calibration from time to time, please provide a download of the day-by-day microphone self-calibration data from the Topsonic system for each of the fixed noise monitors, and confirmation of the frequency and results of manual calibration checks, during 2018 and 2019.	02/08/2022	Responded	The system carries out a number of checks daily, including microphone calibration. This data is provided with this response (see attachment 'Microphone Check 2018-19').	09/08/2022											
				Responded												
15	ES Addendum	We've just noticed today there is yet more data missing from the Table 8B.1 on pdf page 55 of the new "ES Addendum Figures and Appendices". The column headed 2025 Current Limit (DayTime) contains "n/a" all the way down, yet the corresponding columns of figures for 2023 and 2024 are both present. And as we noted yesterday, both the columns for 2028 Current Limit (Daytime and Night-time) are also missing – I've not heard back from you on that. Yet contour plots are provided, it's impossible properly to assess the forecasts and modelling in this Addendum without this data, and I'm inclined (by including Joanna) to ask PINS if they will extend the consultation deadline counting from yesterday for as many days as it takes to get this sorted out. Is there some time for this and any other important missing information to be provided. I also stress again that we do not yet have replies to our other outstanding queries.	03/08/2022	Responded	The 2028 Current Limit data is the same as per the previous submission last year and therefore was not included. However, we didn't need to include the 2028 19 mppa data as this was also the same as last year's submission, but the decision was taken to include this. For 2025, there was no need to have a 2025 Current Limit column of flows as the 19 mppa forecast for 2025 as the meeting the 2025 Current Condition 10 limit and so this has not been duplicated here.	09/08/2022											
				Responded												