

The following questions are not trivial, but these types of consideration are currently ignored in Green Paper.

1. What if policy were designed so that the whole community were taken into account in considering policy option, not primarily business flyers and private corporations? How would policy be different?
2. What if known noise harms were not ignored as an inconvenience and finally acknowledged to be as detrimental to health as current levels of PFAS contamination at some airports (and affecting far more people)? How would policy be different?
3. What if, as a result of the above point, noise limits on actual operations were imposed on actual aircraft operations (in line with noise constraints in other industries), and not completely unregulated so as to avoid potential costs of redeveloping infrastructure and modifying operational convenience? How would policy be different?
4. What if inclusive and independent cost-benefit studies were performed to determine the true benefits and costs (including to the economy, environment and society) of various policy options, instead of assuming a goal of 300% traffic growth and maximizing narrowly defined safety and operational efficiency. How would this affect policy planning?
5. What if policy were designed around outcomes-based approaches to regulation where the desired outcomes took account of safety, security, resilience and community amenity and health, thereby forcing industry to creatively adapt and invest in new operations to fit with the ethical and regulatory requirements specified in the outcomes for these key areas, and also optimizing their profits? Such kind of regulation would inspire true change and development more effectively than giving the industry an exemption and hoping that they will self regulate. How would policy design and regulation be informed?
6. Noting that the goal of aviation is as a mode of transportation, rather than being an end in itself, what if aviation was considered in an integrated manner with other modes of transport of passengers and freight to enhance community connectivity, rather than assuming that commercial aviation is the only feasible option? Why is this not considered more than tangentially in the Green Paper?