Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Waterstaat

> Correspondence address: P.O. Box 20901, 2500 EX The Hague, the Netherlands

President of the House of Representatives
of the States General
P.O. Box 20018
2500 EA The Hague
The Netherlands

Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management

Rijnstraat 8
2515 XP The Hague
The Netherlands
P.O. Box 20901
2500 EX The Hague
The Netherlands

T +31 (0)70 456 0000
F +31 (0)70 456 1111

Ref

IENW/BSK-2022/156292

Date 24 June 2022
Subject Schiphol Outline Letter

Dear President,

Schiphol international airport connects the Netherlands with the rest of the world via an excellent network of destinations. People fly from Schiphol to their relatives or friends in faraway countries, go on holiday by plane now and then, or depart from the airport for a business trip. For a small country like the Netherlands, good international connections contribute enormously to our prosperity. It is thanks to these connections that foreign businesses decide to set up locations in the Netherlands and that Dutch businesses are active all around the world. What's more, goods can be transported to and from the Netherlands quickly, and Schiphol creates jobs as well. It is clear that many Dutch people depend on Schiphol either directly or indirectly.

At the same time, Schiphol is located in one of the most densely populated areas of the Netherlands – a highly urbanised area with lots of business activities. Many people enjoy living, working and spending their spare time in this versatile environment and benefit from the region's great connections. On the other hand, local residents also experience the downsides of living in such a crowded part of the country. Aircraft noise creates a nuisance for them, and they are worried about the negative effects on their health, on nature and on the climate.

In addition, we are faced with various national challenges in the area around Schiphol: reducing the negative effects of aviation on the living environment, making the existing commercial activities and aviation more sustainable, realising agricultural transitions, enforcing the energy network, meeting the need for more homes, improving liveability, and ensuring nature conservation and restoration, among other things in vulnerable dune areas. All these challenges are closely interrelated and are relevant for the quality of life in the area.

The Coalition Agreement states the following:
'Thanks to Amsterdam Schiphol Airport, the Netherlands has excellent connections by air with the rest of the world. Schiphol also provides many jobs, both directly and indirectly. It helps to make the Netherlands an attractive base for multinational companies. We want to preserve this important hub function. At the same time, we must consider the need to reduce the negative impacts of aviation

on people and the environment. The vicinity of the airport faces various challenges associated with emissions of nitrogen, fine and ultrafine particles, noise pollution, quality of life, safety and housing. These demand an integrated solution that will provide certainty and a prospect both for Schiphol in its role as transport hub and for the surrounding area. Decision-making on these issues, and on the opening of Lelystad airport and the new low-altitude approach routes, will take place in 2022.'

The government wants to provide clarity to people around Schiphol soon on how the foregoing is to be realised. Because of the current uncertainty for local residents and the industry, it is time to take concrete steps.

To be able to find a balance between, on the one hand, the importance for the Netherlands of having an international airport and, on the other hand, the importance of having a good-quality living environment, specifically for local residents, the government has been weighing up the various public interests extensively during the past few months. The present letter is intended to illustrate this.

In connection with the interests of local residents, the government has given priority to investigating noise nuisance around the airport. For the broad public interest of Schiphol airport, we have looked into the number of flights needed to maintain the high-quality network of global destinations, so that the airport retains its value for the economy and commercial activities in the Netherlands.

Based on the weighing up of interests, the government has decided to focus on reducing the nuisance caused compared to the period before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, on ending anticipatory enforcement, and on making sure the Netherlands remains adequately connected to the rest of the world. This results in a reduction in the maximum permissible number of aircraft movements to and from Schiphol to 440,000 per year, instead of the 500,000 movements included in the draft Schiphol Airport Traffic Decree (in Dutch: *Luchthavenverkeerbesluit*, or LVB) which were already being realised in practice before the COVID-19 pandemic started. A reduction in the number of aircraft movements results in less noise nuisance and fewer emissions of CO_2, nitrogen, fine and ultra-fine particulate matter and other harmful substances.[1] This is a necessary contribution from the aviation industry. The government is aware of the fact that this decision has enormous consequences for the industry.

The government wants to switch to a focus on standards and in the future on constant reduction of the negative external effects of aviation, in line with the Aviation White Paper (in Dutch: *Luchtvaartnota*). For this, standards need to be developed which will be constantly further tightened. For the standards, the government will use the environmental impact of the maximum of 440,000 aircraft movements as the upper limit. Within this there will be some room for development of the aviation industry, but this must expressly also benefit the

[1] As part of the procedure around the ecological permit (in Dutch: *natuurvergunning*), the impact of a number of scenarios has been analysed. The results of this impact analysis were taken into account in this decision-making process. PwC et al., Report on the Analysis of the Impact of a Reduction of the Level of Activity at Schiphol (2022, in Dutch: *Rapport Impactanalyse verlaging activiteitenniveau Schiphol*); Annex 1 to this Letter to the House of Representatives.

surrounding area. The development and adoption of these standards will take a considerable amount of time. The government has decided to use the maximum of 440,000 aircraft movements per annum in the next five years. If the standards are finalised within five years' time, they can be introduced sooner, however.

Later on in this letter I will further explain the government's decision. I will first address noise nuisance, followed by the connections between the Netherlands and the rest of the world, the relationship with the ecological permit, and the impact on airlines. I will end this letter with an explanation on the subsequent steps to be taken.

Noise and legal certainty for local residents

Since 2015, the New Standards and Enforcement System (in Dutch: *Nieuwe Normen- en Handhavingstelsel*, or NNHS) has been used, in anticipation of a new LVB. The NNHS was drawn up with the aim of reducing noise nuisance, by means of strictly preferential runway use. Since then, anticipatory enforcement based on the NNHS has been applied. In reality, this means that if the limits of the current legal system with enforcement points are exceeded, enforcement does not occur, as long as it is a consequence of flying according to the NNHS. Even though noise nuisance reduction is the point of departure of the NNHS (and is also its consequence for most local residents), as a result of this anticipatory enforcement the legal position of local residents as regards noise nuisance has not been regulated properly for some time now. Local residents cannot rely on noise standards which have been legally established correctly and are enforced as well. The Human Environment and Transport Inspectorate (ILT) previously drew attention to this.[2] It particularly affects a number of local residents who have been faced with additional noise nuisance, contrary to the majority. For this reason, the government has been aiming to lay down the NNHS in the LVB for years, so that the anticipatory enforcement at Schiphol can be terminated.

However, we are still waiting for the NNHS to be laid down in an amended LVB, as a result of the lack of an ecological permit for Schiphol. Therefore, in the opinion of the government it is important to end the poor legal position of local residents – in anticipation of the adoption of an amended LVB. This means that the government will terminate the anticipatory enforcement combined with the continuation of the strictly preferential runway use. I will ask Air Traffic Control the Netherlands (LVNL) to investigate the consequences of this and conduct an implementation test, from the point of view of operational feasibility. To exercise due care, the aim is to terminate the anticipatory enforcement at the start of the IATA winter season of 2023/2024 (see below under 'Subsequent steps'). To prevent additional noise nuisance for all local residents, it is moreover of great importance to maintain the strictly preferential runway use, with the Polder Runway and the Kaag Runway being primarily used.[3]

[2] Parliamentary Papers II 2021/22, 29665, no. 418.
[3] To70, Memorandum on the Impact of Termination of Anticipatory Enforcement at Schiphol on Annual Volume and Preferential Runway Use (2022, in Dutch: *Notitie Effect op jaarvolume en preferentieel baangebruik bij beëindigen anticiperend handhaven op Schiphol over effect van stopzetten van anticiperend handhaven*); Annex 2 to this Letter to the House of Representatives.

The result of the foregoing is that Schiphol's capacity will decrease, because transgression of the limit values at existing enforcement points will no longer be condoned. Research into the effects of the termination of anticipatory enforcement shows that the number of aircraft movements at Schiphol will have to be reduced both to remain within the limits at the enforcement points and to apply strictly preferential runway use. If the existing enforcement points are relied upon, the decrease will depend on fleet development. A scan by aviation research consultancy To70 resulted in a bandwidth of approximately 400,000-465,000[4] aircraft movements, depending mainly on fleet renewal.

A lower number of flights means less noise and fewer substance emissions. As a result, the total noise nuisance around the airport will decrease, but this does not mean that the situation will improve (in equal measure) in all parts of the surrounding area.

The government is aware of the fact that additional steps are still needed to reduce noise nuisance in the vicinity of the airport. For this reason, the government remains committed to the programme-based approach to noise, which you were informed about on 10 December 2021 and 25 February 2022.[5] In this approach the reduction of noise nuisance caused by aviation will be addressed via three tracks: control measures to reduce noise nuisance for the surrounding area at the source, impact-reducing measures, like façade insulation, and innovation-oriented measures, like noise-adaptive construction. In this context the government is investigating how and to what degree measures such as fleet renewal, operational adjustments or, for example, volume reductions during the night can help reduce noise nuisance, how long this will take and under which conditions it can be realised. In addition, the government intends to initiate a study into the question of whether the individual legal protection offered is adequate – or how it can be safeguarded – in the current system with enforcement points, in the NNHS and in a future standards system.

Connections between the Netherlands and the rest of the world
Against the background of the wish to terminate anticipatory enforcement, to maintain the strictly preferential runway use and to improve the quality of life, the government has conducted an analysis to determine whether it is still possible to maintain an adequate network of connections with the rest of the world over the coming years after reducing the number of aircraft movements.[6] A bandwidth of roughly 400,000-440,000 aircraft movements follows from this analysis.

The analysis and the critical review of it by several independent external parties[7] confirm that it is difficult to provide hard scientific evidence of the minimum

[4] To70, Memorandum on the Impact of Termination of Anticipatory Enforcement at Schiphol on Annual Volume and Preferential Runway Use (2022); Annex 2 to this Letter to the House of Representatives.

[5] Parliamentary Papers II 2021/22, 29665, no. 418, and 29665, no. 422.

[6] Analysis and Critical Review of the Destination Analysis for Adequate Connections (2022, in Dutch: *Analyse en Critical review bestemmingenanalyse voor adequate bereikbaarheid*); Annexes 3a and 3b to this Letter to the House of Representatives.

[7] The Critical Review of the Destination Analysis for Adequate Connections was conducted by CE Delft, Erasmus UPT and SEO Amsterdam Economics; Annexes 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e to this Letter to the House of Representatives.

number of aircraft movements that is needed to guarantee the quality of the network at Schiphol. Whichever methodology is used, any statement on the volume of Schiphol in relation to maintenance of the network quality and the attractiveness of the business climate will always be surrounded by dilemmas and uncertainty.

If a new capacity limitation for Schiphol is introduced, airlines will adjust the network and possibly their business model to anticipate market opportunities in the new situation. The applicable EU legislation does not provide any scope for direct control by the government of the destination network. The Netherlands keeps striving for more national policy scope to control public interests, such as network quality, when relevant EU legislation is revised. This requires patience. Due to the unusual situation that is now arising at Schiphol, the government will assess once more whether control through pricing mechanisms is possible, for example – within the existing strict limits. Consultations will be held in this regard with parties in the industry and the European Commission, where relevant.

Taking into account the described uncertainties and the lack of control options, the general idea is that adequate connectedness of the Netherlands over the coming years can be achieved with 440,000 aircraft movements to and from Schiphol. In the Aviation White Paper it was announced that a new policy framework for network quality is being developed. This framework will be used to monitor how the Netherlands is connected to the main destinations in Europe and the rest of the world. This enables the government to detect at an early stage how the network quality is developing, also in relation to foreign hub airports. As was promised in the Aviation Committee Debate on 24 February 2022, the framework will be shared with the House of Representatives during the second half of this year. If this leads to new insights, I will inform your House about this.

The combination of the described need to terminate anticipatory enforcement and the wish to improve the quality of life, as well as the expectation that the network of destinations will remain adequate, has led to the government taking a new maximum of 440,000 aircraft movements per year as its point of departure for Schiphol.

A reduction to a maximum capacity of 440,000 aircraft movements may result in Schiphol having a less favourable competitive position compared to a number of the other larger hub airports in Europe and the Middle East[8], such as Frankfurt, Paris Charles de Gaulle, London Heathrow and Dubai. If a lower maximum was opted for, this risk would be greater. In the case of 440,000 aircraft movements, however, the expectation is that the main destinations for the Netherlands can remain part of the network.

The possible opening of Lelystad Airport as an overflow airport for Schiphol is being regarded in this context. The airport must have a nitrogen permit within the meaning of the Nature Conservation Act (in Dutch: *Wet natuurbescherming*, or Wnb) and it must be possible to solve the issues with low-altitude flight routes.

[8] The competing hub airports in the annual benchmark for airport fees and government levies of Brussels, Paris Charles de Gaulle, Copenhagen, Düsseldorf, Dubai, Frankfurt, Istanbul, London Gatwick, London Heathrow, Madrid, Munich and Zurich.

These matters are expected to take some time. Therefore, decisions cannot be made until mid-2024.

Perspective for aviation
The new capacity forms an absolute limit for negative effects of aviation on the surrounding area, within which all future developments must remain. A development perspective for the longer term may come about after the LVB has been completed. In line with the policy set out in the Aviation White Paper, the government wants to lay down these limits as soon as possible as limits which are constantly tightened and not in new numbers. This means that noise nuisance for the surrounding area must be reduced. For the standards, the government will use the environmental effects of the maximum of 440,000 aircraft movements as the upper limit. Within this there will be some room for development of the aviation industry, but this must expressly also benefit the surrounding area. Over the coming years we will develop new frameworks in this context for safety, sustainability, quality of life and connectedness, in consultation with all stakeholders.

In addition, we are aiming for further innovation of border processes and other processes at Schiphol to maintain the attractiveness and competitive position of Schiphol as a hub within the new frameworks as much as possible. To set up the checks as efficiently as we can, within the new EU safety requirements, and to further promote mobility, the government is investing in a new border concept. The government keeps focusing on innovation via other initiatives as well, like Digital Travel Credentials (DTCs) and home enrolment, Registered Traveller Programmes (RTP-NL) and pre-clearance. These initiatives help realise improvements in terms of safety and quality for passengers, the long-term development of Schiphol and the commitment of all parties involved.

Relationship with the ecological permit
Schiphol is one of the many companies in the Netherlands that need an ecological permit. The Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality asked Schiphol to apply for an ecological permit in 2019. In the 2020 report entitled Not Everything Is Possible Everywhere (in Dutch: *Niet alles kan overal*), the Advisory Council on Nitrogen Problems (in Dutch: *Adviescollege Stikstofproblematiek*) led by Mr Remkes recommended having all industries contribute to the reduction in nitrogen emissions. The aviation industry also emits nitrogen. The Advisory Council indicated that, even though the share of the nitrogen deposition caused by aviation is very limited, aviation must help reduce nitrogen emissions as well. Following this advice, Schiphol drew up a plan to limit its nitrogen emissions, among other things through electrification of its ground operations. By reducing the number of aircraft movements, an extra step is being taken in the reduction of those emissions, besides other measures which are needed to reduce nitrogen deposition and to obtain an ecological permit.

Even though the impact of this government decision to limit the maximum capacity at Schiphol contributes to the reduction in nitrogen emissions, this is not the reason why this decision has been made. It does help achieve the necessary reduction in the nitrogen deposition by aviation, however.

Royal HaskoningDHV (RHDHV) has conducted an exploratory study into the deposition reduction task of Schiphol and possible sources for set-off[9]. Based on this study the expectation is that, even if the maximum number of aircraft movements is reduced to 440,000 per year, a residual reduction task will remain. Investigating the exact deposition reduction task and any possible measures for internal and external set-off is Schiphol's responsibility; this is required for the permit application by the company. The competent authority will assess Schiphol's permit application and the additional documents submitted.

In connection with this government decision, I am asking Schiphol to take account of the decision in its permit application, so that the competent authority can consider this in its assessment of the application. The government is committed to allowing operations at Schiphol airport to continue until an ecological permit has been granted and the LVB has been amended – within the applicable legal constraints.

Consequences for the aviation industry

Slots

The European Slot Regulation[10] contains rules about slot allocation at Community airports. Schiphol draws up a capacity statement twice a year. The capacity statement contains all available capacity for that season, taking into account technical, operational and environmental limitations. On this basis, the independent slot coordinator allocates slots to airlines for each season. As long as they actually use 80 percent of the slots in a year, they can claim the same series of slots in the next similar season based on the Slot Regulation.[11] These are so-called historical slots. If the available capacity at Schiphol is determined to be lower due to a new environmental parameter that follows from the laying down in legislation of the government decision, not all claims for historical slots can be granted by the slot coordinator. This will have consequences for the running of the airport and therefore also for the business operations of the airlines. For this reason, the time when the reduction in the capacity of an airport is realised must be determined with great care. In the European Regulation on noise-related operating restrictions[12] at Union airports within a Balanced Approach, rules have been laid down for this.[13] This Regulation has been in force since 13 June 2016. The gradual capacity reduction will therefore need to be agreed on with the European Commission (EC). See the further information under 'Subsequent steps'.

[9] Parliamentary Papers II 2021/22, 29665, no. 420 and no. 421, and RHDHV, Report on the Exploration of Possible Measures for Mitigation or Compensation of the Deposition Reduction Task for Schiphol (2022, in Dutch: *Rapport Verkenning mogelijke maatregelen voor mitigatie of compensatie van de depositieopgave voor Schiphol*); Annex 4 to this Letter to the House of Representatives, as promised to your House in the letter dated 18 February 2022 (Parliamentary Papers II 2021/22, 29665, no. 420). The report describes sources of emissions in the Schiphol region, but expressly does not offer insight into the emission reductions that could be realised at individual businesses.

[10] Council Regulation (EEC) No 95/93 of 18 January 1993 on common rules for the allocation of slots at Community airports (OJEC 1993, L 14).

[11] This rule was temporarily amended during the COVID-19 pandemic to prevent airlines from flying empty or near-empty aircraft to keep their slots.

[12] A noise-related operating restriction is a measure that has consequences for the noise climate around an airport and that reduces access to or the operational capacity of an airport.

[13] Regulation (EU) No 598/2014 on noise-related operating restrictions at Union airports.

The fact that not all claims for historical slots can be granted by the slot coordinator may mean that airlines will look into the options for requesting compensation for this. For the time being, it is not certain that this will happen, also in view of the expected growth path.

Airlines
The current number of 500,000 aircraft movements is distributed among a large number of airlines. The expectation is that the capacity reduction will be borne by these airlines more or less in proportion to their market share.

In 2019, the most recent full 'normal' year before the number of aircraft movements dropped drastically due to COVID-19, approximately half of these movements were flown by home carrier KLM. The KLM Group (KLM, Transavia and Martinair Cargo) accounted for 286,000 aircraft movements. Together, the KLM Group and Air France operated 295,000 flights in 2019.

A limitation of the number of aircraft movements at Schiphol impacts all airlines, but especially KLM, because KLM accounts for a large share of flights at Schiphol. In an absolute sense, the impact is greater for KLM than for other airlines. A reduction in the number of aircraft movements may mean that the company has to make some hard and complex choices for the future.

The expectation is that due to this government decision, airlines will not only be faced with a greater scarcity of slots, but also with effects on the fees charged by the airport and air traffic control. If Schiphol can accommodate fewer flights, the costs will have to be paid for by fewer aircraft movements and passengers. Airlines are expected to adjust their networks to the new market dynamics.

Subsequent steps
Implementation
In view of the significant impact of the government's decision on the aviation industry, we attach great importance to careful implementation. For this, the following steps are being elaborated and implemented:

- Due to the relationship between the LVB and the granting of an ecological permit to Schiphol, it cannot be predicted with certainty when the amendment to the LVB will be finalised. After all, the required addition to the appropriate assessment for obtaining an ecological permit also underlies the LVB, in which the NNHS is being laid down.
- This means that I am preparing an adjustment to the amendment to the LVB which is already going through the procedure, and this adjustment will be sent to your House together with the Memorandum of Reply (in Dutch: *Nota van antwoord*), after the appropriate assessment has been supplemented by Schiphol.
- I will ask Schiphol to exclude slots for which no historical claims are made from the available capacity as soon as possible, so that these slots can no longer be allocated by the slot coordinator.
- In addition, with immediate effect we will start all procedures which must be conducted to exercise due care and on the basis of EU legislation. A start will be made immediately with the preparations which are needed to carefully realise this within the scope of the applicable international

legislation, like the Balanced Approach (see below). Consultations with the EC on this topic will be initiated before the summer. The industry will be involved in this as well. One part of this procedure is the decrease in the number of night flights already included in the Aviation White Paper, which will be reflected in the next amendment to the LVB. The number of permissible night flights at Schiphol will be reduced from 32,000 to 29,000. In connection with this decision and in accordance with the Aviation White Paper, I will work out the details of the further reduction in the number of night flights.

- Moreover, as I have said before, I will terminate the anticipatory enforcement with a view to its undesirably long duration and the impact study carried out by To70.[14] Account will also need to be taken of the continuation of the strictly preferential runway use. The Polder Runway and the Kaag Runway are the preferential runways from a noise perspective; this does not apply to the Zwanenburg Runway. It appears from the analysis by To70 that it is possible in theory to use the Zwanenburg Runway more frequently than under the NNHS. This may have local effects on the extent of the nuisance experienced due to the use of the Zwanenburg Runway. The industry is aiming expressly for noise nuisance reduction, among other things through the Nuisance Reduction Implementation Plan (in Dutch: *Uitvoeringsplan Hinderreductie*) which I informed your House about recently.[15] My intention is to reach agreement on this with LVNL.
- In anticipation of the LVB amendment and the granting of the ecological permit, I want to lay down the new maximum of 440,000 aircraft movements, the strict rules for preferential runway use and the slot reduction via a ministerial regulation, in order for ILT to be able to enforce these aspects.

The aim is to have the new maximum number of aircraft movements reflected in the capacity statement for the 2023/2024 winter season in the spring of 2023.

Balanced Approach
The process that must be followed in accordance with EU legislation for capacity reductions, both for the amendment to the LVB and for any intermediate steps, concerns the Balanced Approach referred to above. This procedure, which has been laid down on a European level, provides for a consultation and notification process regarding an operating restriction measure which affects the noise caused in the surrounding area. In the opinion of the government it is of great importance that all stakeholders, including the aviation industry, are consulted and the government will use this process for this.

The Regulation lays down rules for when EU Member States want to reduce the capacity of airports exceeding 50,000 commercial aircraft movements. This is regarded as a restriction of airport operations, for which the Balanced Approach procedure must be followed. In the Balanced Approach, it must be substantiated

[14] To70, Memorandum on the Impact of Termination of Anticipatory Enforcement at Schiphol on Annual Volume and Preferential Runway Use (2022); Annex 2 to this Letter to the House of Representatives.

[15] Parliamentary Papers II 2021/22, 29665, no. 424.

why the capacity of the airport is being restricted and what purpose this serves. Measures cannot be more restrictive than is necessary in order to achieve the environmental noise abatement objectives set for the airport. In practice this means that consultations will have to take place with Schiphol airport, air navigation service providers, airlines and other stakeholders, and of course also with the European Commission. At the moment we are expecting this process to take at least nine months.

CO_2 limitation for international aviation
The development of air traffic at Schiphol has important consequences for the CO_2 emissions caused by international aviation from the Netherlands, for which the government has set goals in the Aviation White Paper. As was indicated in the letter to your House dated 10 May 2022[16], an integrated impact study is currently taking place to investigate the different variants for the specification of CO_2 limitation. With this limitation, the government aims to ensure the achievement of the CO_2 goals of the Aviation White Paper. The government wants the impact study to provide clarity based on current insights. The decision-making on the maximum capacity at Schiphol as discussed in this letter probably results in an extension of the ongoing impact study. The House of Representatives will be further informed about the consequences of this for the time frame of the CO_2 limitation (and the decision-making in this regard).

Regional approach for Schiphol NOVEX area
The decision to reduce the maximum number of aircraft movements at Schiphol to 440,000 per year is an important step in the restoration of the balance in the quality of life in the area. However, the government and the province of Noord-Holland are well aware of the fact that further improvement can only be achieved if more decisions are made. They have jointly concluded that a cohesive approach is needed for this.

The set of challenges that we are faced with in the region (including constructing more homes, making commercial activities more sustainable, realising agricultural transitions, enforcing the energy network, conserving and improving nature) cannot be seen separately from one another. For example, if commercial activities in the area are made more sustainable, this can create room for more residential construction thanks to the reduction in nitrogen emissions. And without extra room for nitrogen emissions, sustainability improvement and the required enforcement of the energy network cannot be achieved either. For this reason, in early 2022 we agreed to develop a joint regional agenda aimed at improving the quality of life in the area.

The Minister for Housing and Spatial Planning (VRO) informed your House on 17 May 2022 on the designation of Schiphol as a NOVEX area (consisting of 4 provinces and 56 municipalities).[17] This approach means that the government is tightening its control in order to regard the combined challenges in the area concerned in relation to one another, together with other public bodies, and to make decisions on them, while all parties retain their responsibilities. Under this heading, the regional agenda will also be decided upon. The first visible result of

[16] Parliamentary Papers II 2021/22, 31936, no. 935
[17] Parliamentary Papers II 2021/22, 34682, no. 92.

this will be an administrative agreement ('BOK' in Dutch) in which the parties agree with one another how they will jointly approach the challenges. The BOK will be concluded in the summer, after which a regional process involving the surrounding area will be initiated.

Conclusion
The government realises that this decision does not solve all problems. Many people will keep experiencing noise nuisance caused by air traffic. We need to keep working on this – besides this capacity reduction – among other things via the regional approach referred to above and the programme-based approach to noise. In addition, for airlines this government decision involves a restriction of their options as well as considerable uncertainty. And even though the first steps will be taken as soon as possible, as has been explained in this letter, we expect that it will take a while for the LVB to be amended and for the legal uncertainty to be resolved. Your House will be informed about further developments in subsequent progress reports.

Over the coming period, all stakeholders will be involved in the further elaboration of the decision and the subsequent regional approach. The Schiphol Environmental Council (in Dutch: *Omgevingsraad Schiphol*, or ORS) / Schiphol Social Council (in Dutch: *Maatschappelijke Raad Schiphol*, or MRS) will naturally also be involved because of their formal position, in accordance with the motion by Van der Molen.[18]

By reducing the maximum capacity of the airport in this way, the government is taking an important, big step in creating a new balance between the interests of people living near Schiphol and the importance of the international connections of the Netherlands with the rest of the world. The situation in which Schiphol was able to grow to over 500,000 flights is being replaced with a situation where we will remain well below that figure. This fulfils the commitment in the Coalition Agreement and implements the motion by Kröger et al.[19] to make a decision in 2022 on an integrated solution that offers certainty and perspective for both the hub function of Schiphol and the area around the airport.

Yours sincerely,

THE MINISTER OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND WATER MANAGEMENT,

Mark Harbers

[18] Parliamentary Papers II 2021/22, 31936, no. 931.
[19] Parliamentary Papers II 2021/22, 31936, no. 949.

Annexes to this Letter to the House of Representatives:

1	Report on the Analysis of the Impact of a Reduction of the Level of Activity at Schiphol (PwC et al.)
2	Memorandum on the Impact of Termination of Anticipatory Enforcement at Schiphol on Annual Volume and Preferential Runway Use (To70)
3a	Destination Analysis for Adequate Connections
3b	Memorandum on Critical Review of the Estimation of the Destination Network (in Dutch: *Notitie critical review inschatting bestemmingennetwerk*)
3c	Review by SEO Amsterdam Economics
3d	Review by Erasmus UPT
3e	Review by CE Delft
4	Report on the Exploration of Possible Measures for Mitigation or Compensation of the Deposition Reduction Task for Schiphol (RHDHV).