

DP No	Design Principle	From	Feedback (text copied from emails)	ACP Sponsor analysis	DP change required?	Revised DP	DDP weighting
1	a	Provide a safe environment for airspace users	[REDACTED]	I endorse the design principles you are proposing.	Nil	No	
2			[REDACTED]	Several Flight Safety related queries: 1. Considering the size of the aircraft and it's anticipation to fly in the majority of UK Airspace without restriction, will the IR rated RAF pilots have the ability to communicate via civilian VHF frequencies as to its presence. For example to notify all airspace users that would be monitoring Approach / Tower / AG or even safety com and therefore building a good situational awareness of its position and intentions ? 2. Presumably the aircraft will be operating at heights that it may encounter traffic outside of controlled airspace, with this in mind will Protector have the ability to electronically "see" other traffic and relay this to the operators so they can take appropriate avoiding action if required ? 3. Regarding avoiding other users of airspace, will the Protector be routinely squawking Mode S / C information in order for both Air Traffic Controllers and electronic devices to determine its position and height and therefore increase situational awareness to all users either through Controller verbal traffic information or devices such as Sky Echo for example ?	These 3 questions are related to platform specification not Draft Design Principles (DDPs). However, they are flight safety related so appropriate for inclusion at DDP (a). Able to inform stakeholder that Protector will have a full radio communications fit, TCAS, ADS-B and transponder.	No	
3			[REDACTED]	1. The BMAA considers that the UK airspace's default classification is G and that sponsors must establish a safety case for proposing to change this class or add any further restrictions or requirements by their ACP.	Not at the design options stage yet, so unable to comment about the likelihood of changing airspace classification. DDP (a) supports the provision of a safe environment for airspace users and CAP 1616 process requires significant safety work.	No	
4			[REDACTED]	We feel that the safety of all pilots can be protected by less Draconian measures: - by the use of NOTAMS covering departure and recovery periods. This works well for most pilots who now can receive updates whilst flying, or they can, in addition, still look at the published NOTAMS. - listening squawks work well around larger airfields; why not for the RAF? Controllers would be aware of traffic and could contact approaching aircraft. - mandatory transponder zone, modes C and S could be imposed, but this lacks, as I understand it, a two way communication. - many aircraft are now equipped with Pilot Aware, Flarm, Sky Echo. Will the Protector be equipped with a transponder to help passing pilots build up a good situational awareness picture of local traffic?	Safety concern - DDP (a) supports. NOTAM suggestion addressed in DDP (g). The potential to utilise Listening squawks and TMZ is supported by DDP (d). Question about transponder fit is safety-related. Able to inform stakeholder that Protector will be fitted with transponder and that the MOD supports interoperable electronic conspicuity.	No	
5			[REDACTED]	From previous experience, there is every chance of any temporary airspace restrictions becoming permanent. With regard to the design principles, e, and f are of concern, always with the overriding safety aspect of a. I have no idea of the intended operation of the Protector, but sensible safeguards and procedures should minimise disruption to the likes of me, rather than a blanket restriction.	Weighting for DDP (a) noted. MOD acknowledges the concern regarding any temporary airspace restrictions becoming permanent. However, this is not the MOD's intention and in adhering to the CAP 1616 process and wider CAA regulation a temporary change could not become permanent without further process and justification.	No	Weighting given to (a)
6			[REDACTED]	Thank you for an opportunity to comment upon the proposed Design Principles as part of Stage 1B of your ACP. We have engaged with MOD stakeholders and agree with your proposed design principles. We agree that the priority should be a – safety and b – access to adequate airspace is key to achieve training and operational objectives for Protector. We believe that the next priority thereafter should be e – minimise the impact to other airspace users, both in activation and volume of airspace required.	Priority 1	No	Weighting given to (a)
7			[REDACTED]	Item a should be Priority 1, adding the word "all" before "airspace users".	Priority 1 It is the MOD's intent to provide a safe environment for those airspace users abiding by airspace regulation and the processes and procedures put in place by the airspace design and safety assessment work. The MOD cannot be held to account for any disregard for the above and would, therefore prefer to omit "all" from the DDP.	No	Weighting given to (a)
8			[REDACTED]	The BMAA considers that the UK airspace's default classification is G and that sponsors must establish a safety case for proposing to change this class or add any further restrictions or requirements by their ACP.	Not at the design options stage yet, so unable to comment about the likelihood of changing airspace classification. DDP (a) supports the provision of a safe environment for airspace users and CAP 1616 process requires significant safety work.	No	
9	b	Provide access to sufficient area for both training and operational objectives	[REDACTED]	I endorse the design principles you are proposing.	Nil	No	
10			[REDACTED]	Any airspace implementation must be of minimum size and duration to encompass the operation of the asset – and no more.	Noted the stakeholder's concern about size and duration. It is the MOD's intention to do this whilst preserving ability to achieve flying objectives. Also addressed in DDP (e)	No	
11			[REDACTED]	Any airspace implementations/restrictions must be of minimum time and size to allow for the safe operation of the asset.	Noted the stakeholder's concern about size and duration. It is the MOD's intention to do this whilst preserving ability to achieve flying objectives. Also addressed in DDP (e)	No	
12			[REDACTED]	Thank you for an opportunity to comment upon the proposed Design Principles as part of Stage 1B of your ACP. We have engaged with MOD stakeholders and agree with your proposed design principles. We agree that the priority should be a – safety and b – access to adequate airspace is key to achieve training and operational objectives for Protector. We believe that the next priority thereafter should be e – minimise the impact to other airspace users, both in activation and volume of airspace required.	Priority 2	No	Weighting given to (b)

13				Item b should be joint Priority 2	would like this to be Joint Priority 2 with a new DP (Minimise impacts on the existing ATS route structure). See line 53 for analysis of new item.	No		
14	c	Be in accordance with current airspace regulation		I endorse the design principles you are proposing.		No		
15				Item c may not be required because either (i) you can't progress anything which falls outside the current regulations anyway, or (ii) you'll need to bring in new regulations to manage the flight of these devices in the UK, thus rendering the "current" text redundant.	Agreed. DDP (c) was of little importance to any stakeholders and can be dispensed with.	Yes	Delete DDP (c)	
16	d	Where possible and practicable, accommodate the emerging Airspace Modernisation Strategy		I endorse the design principles you are proposing.	Nil	No		
17				Sponsors should ensure that there will be measures to allow flexible use of airspace and prepare for the wider use of electronic conspicuity devices and interoperability with existing e-conspicuity, e.g. FLARM and Pilot Aware etc..	MOD supports interoperable electronic conspicuity Also addressed in DDP (g)	No		
18				In line with the principles of the Airspace Modernisation (was FAS) principles the ACP must respect the requirement for minimum airspace volumes designed for efficiency and reduced environmental impact. These principles will include: - Minimum size of controlled airspace; - Minimum number of departure/arrival routes; - Steeper and continuous climbs and descents for cost and environmental benefits as well as minimisation of CAS footprint.	Supported in DDP (d)	No		
19				Sponsors must show how they are integrating their proposal within the overall UK airspace modernisation context, for example proposals which do not connect efficiently between upper and lower airspace (potentially under different airspace "management") would only inhibit overall airspace efficiency and therefore not receive our support)	The MOD will demonstrate in Stage 2	No		
20				We feel that the safety of all pilots can be protected by less Draconian measures: - listening squawks work well around larger airfields; why not for the RAF? Controllers would be aware of traffic and could contact approaching aircraft. - mandatory transponder zone, modes C and S could be imposed, but this lacks, as I understand it, a two way communication.	The MOD will consider in Stage 2	No		
21				Item d should be joint Priority 3	Ranking noted. No change to the DDP (d)	No		
22				Sponsors should ensure that there will be measures to allow flexible use of airspace and prepare for the wider use of electronic conspicuity devices and interoperability with existing e-conspicuity, e.g. FLARM and Pilot Aware etc..	MOD supports interoperable electronic conspicuity Also addressed in DDP (g)	No		
23				In line with the principles of the Airspace Modernisation (was FAS) principles the ACP must respect the requirement for minimum airspace volumes designed for efficiency and reduced environmental impact. These principles will include: - Minimum size of controlled airspace; - Minimum number of departure/arrival routes; - Steeper and continuous climbs and descents for cost and environmental benefits as well as minimisation of CAS footprint.	Supported in DDP (d)	No		
24				Sponsors must show how they are integrating their proposal within the overall UK airspace modernisation context (for example, proposals which do not connect efficiently between upper and lower airspace (potentially under different airspace "management") would only inhibit overall airspace efficiency and therefore not receive our support.	The MOD will demonstrate in Stage 2	No		
25	e	Minimise the impact to other airspace users, both in activation and volume of airspace required		I endorse the design principles you are proposing.	Nil			
26				Minimise impact through focussing the design on providing a corridor above 5000ft from Waddington MATZ to the Wash danger area and keeping all activity over the sea and East of Waddington.	This does not constitute a DP, but it supports the desire to minimise the impact on other airspace users, particularly those operating below 5000ft. The actual airspace design option phase will commence after the DDPs have been agreed. Stakeholder invited to participate in Stage 2.	No		
27				This is just surfacing on the aviation forums and causes significant concerns regarding a grab of airspace, an over zealous determination of required airspace and the drastic effect it would have for GA within the local area. Having been involved in commercial aviation for over 30 years, mainly as a Captain of medium to large airliners, I see unjustified expansion of airspace as unnecessary and intrusive ...As this proposal develops, we will be monitoring it very carefully and objecting to any attempt to increase Waddington's airspace more than is absolutely necessary.	Concerns are supported by DDPs (e - f). CAP 1616 requires change to be justified. Stakeholder invited to participate in Stage 2.	No		
28				I would like to record a particular interest in (e) i.e. impact on other airspace users etc. As one of a number of people who operate powered aircraft and gliders from very close to or within the existing Waddington MATZ, I am concerned that in meeting the other design principles, particularly (b), our access to airspace may be restricted. Whilst I appreciate that the extent and times of such restrictions are yet to be established I fear that our views may be under-represented and I particularly urge the designers to give due weight to principle (e).	Concern supported by DDP (e). Noted weighting on this DDP.	No		Weighting given to (e)

Feedback Organised by Draft Design Principles

29				In line with the principles of the Airspace Modernisation (was FAS) principles the ACP must respect the requirement for minimum airspace volumes designed for efficiency and reduced environmental impact. These principles will include: - Minimum size of controlled airspace; - Minimum number of departure/arrival routes; - Steeper and continuous climbs and descents for cost and environmental benefits as well as minimisation of CAS footprint.	Type of airspace to be analysed at Stage 2, but DDP (e) supports this concern.	No		
30				Optimisation of the development work above and below the 7,000ft NATS en-route split.	Will engage with NATS	No		
31				We realize this is in the very early stage of planning but, to impose a possibly permanent restricted airspace seems excessive, for the number of likely flights made by the Protector.	It is not the MOD's intention to impliment permanent airspace. Any change will be managed under FUA principles. Stakeholder advised of this.	No		
32				Any airspace implementation must be of minimum size and duration to encompass the operation of the asset – and no more.	Implies desire to minimise the effects on other airspace users. This DDP supports this.	No		
33				All of design points A - H must be fully considered and implemented proportionately to the scale and intensity of operation of the Protector. Particularly, however, due weight must be given to points E and F,	CAP 1616 requires any airspace change to be fully justified and proportionate to the activity concerned. Weighting for DDP (e) noted. Comments further considered in DDP (f)	No		Weighting given to (e)
34				The design points A-H must be properly considered and any airspace changes proportionate to the volume and intensity of Protector traffic. Due regard must given to points E and F.	Weighting for DDP (e) noted. Comments further considered in DDP (f)	No		Weighting given to (e)
35				Any airspace implementations/restrictions must be of minimum time and size to allow for the safe operation of the asset.	Implies desire to minimise the effects on other airspace users. This DDP supports this.	No		
36				As far as the design principles are concerned, in my mind, items E, F and G are the most critical for General Aviation.	Weighting for DDP (e) noted.	No		Weighting given to (e)
37				From previous experience, there is every chance of any temporary airspace restrictions becoming permanent. With regard to the design principles, e, and f are of concern, always with the overriding safety aspect of a. I have no idea of the intended operation of the Protector, but sensible safeguards and procedures should minimise disruption to the likes of me, rather than a blanket restriction.	Weighting for DDP (e) noted	No		Weighting given to (e)
38				Thank you for an opportunity to comment upon the proposed Design Principles as part of Stage 1B of your ACP. We have engaged with MOD stakeholders and agree with your proposed design principles. We agree that the priority should be a – safety and b – access to adequate airspace is key to achieve training and operational objectives for Protector. We believe that the next priority thereafter should be e – minimise the impact to other airspace users, both in activation and volume of airspace required.	Noted priority given	No		Priority 3 given to (e)
39				Item e need only read “Minimise the impact to other airspace users” and should also be joint Priority 3.	Agree. Ranking noted	Yes	Minimise the impact to other airspace users	Priority 3 given to (e)
40				Minimum size of existing and any proposed controlled airspace	Type of airspace to be analysed at Stage 2, but DDP (e) supports this concern.	No		
41				Steeper and continuous climbs and descents for cost and environmental benefits as well as minimisation of controlled airspace footprint	Cost and environmental benefits TBD but MOD aim is to minimise airspace impact in line with this DDP	No		
42				Optimisation of the development work above and below the 7,000ft NATS en-route split	Supported by this DDP in order to minimise impact on other airspace users. MOD notes importance of NATS engagement.	No		
43	f	Endeavour to make the airspace as accessible as possible		I endorse the design principles you are proposing.	Nil	No		
44				Sponsors must accept the assumption that GA including sporting and recreational aviation is entitled to continued safe use of airspace and that commercial aviation does not have a right to limit airspace access.	Not commercial operation, but concerned about access by GA. This DDP supports this.	No		
45				All of design points A - H must be fully considered and implemented proportionately to the scale and intensity of operation of the Protector. Particularly, however, due weight must be given to points E and F, The airspace Change Sponsor (RAF or contractor) must guarantee provision of adequate staffing levels to ensure no unnecessary restriction of activity to other airspace users due to presence of any airspace activated as a result of this ACP. This must include times when airspace is activated but not in use, and thus potentially could potentially otherwise result in lack the ATC cover required to enable transits by GA such at weekends/evenings Public Holidays etc. Any airspace implementation must be of minimum size and duration to encompass the operation of the asset – and no more.	Weighting for DDP (f) noted. The availability of air traffic services will have a great effect on the accessibility of any airspace implemented and will be a key point of discussion during Stage 2. The stakeholder advised of this and invited to take part in Stage 2 engagement. Addressed in DDP (e) too.	No		Weighting given to (f)

Feedback Organised by Draft Design Principles

46			██████████ ██████████ ██████████	The design points A-H must be properly considered and any airspace changes proportionate to the volume and intensity of Protector traffic. Due regard must given to points E and F. RAF Waddington must guarantee adequate ATC staffing levels to ensure that unnecessary restrictions to other airspace users due to any airspace activated by this ACP do not occur. This must include weekends evenings and bank holidays. Any airspace implementations/restrictions must be of minimum time and size to allow for the safe operation of the asset.	Weighting for DDP (f) noted. The availability of air traffic services will have a great effect on the accessibility of any airspace implemented and will be a key point of discussion during Stage 2. The stakeholder advised of this and invited to take part in Stage 2 engagement. Comments further considered in DDP (e)	No		
47			██████████	As far as the design principles are concerned, in my mind, items E, F and G are the most critical for General Aviation.	Weighting for DDP (f) noted.	No		Weighting given to (f)
48			██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	From previous experience, there is every chance of any temporary airspace restrictions becoming permanent. With regard to the design principles, e, and f are of concern, always with the overriding safety aspect of a. I have no idea of the intended operation of the Protector, but sensible safeguards and procedures should minimise disruption to the likes of me, rather than a blanket restriction.	Weighting for DDP (f) noted	No		Weighting given to (f)
49			██████████	Items f and g are not required because they are ways of achieving Item e and can be explored during the development of any potential design option via engagement with NATS and other stakeholder groups.	The MOD understands the logic, but DDP (f) is seen as important to GA, so it will remain.	No		
50			██████████	Recognition that GA including sporting and recreational aviation has legitimate rights of access to airspace.	Concerned about access by GA. This DDP supports this.	No		
51	g	Use Flexible Use of Airspace (FUA) principles to manage the airspace as far as is practicable (Efficiency and Airspace Sharing)	██████████ ██████████	I endorse the design principles you are proposing.	Nil	No		
52			██████████ ██████████	With regard to the MOD additional Airspace requirements, the information currently provided indicates a coloured circle centred over RAF Waddington. Is it possible to provide exact lateral and vertical dimensions with the proposed classification of airspace in order to get a better understanding how this will directly impact GA operations of airfields that lie within the vicinity of RAF Waddington. If airspace is ever allocated for this remotely piloted vehicle will it be on a flexible basis through the NOTAM system for example ?	Advised that the red circle is a function of the CAA online portal to inform visitors of an ACP within their area of interest. Actual size and shape to be developed in Stage 2. Invited to participate. Request for flexible basis of airspace activation is supported by DDP (g). Stakeholder advised of this. DDP (g) important to this stakeholder.	No		
53			██████████	Sponsors should ensure that there will be measures to allow flexible use of airspace and prepare for the wider use of electronic conspicuity devices and interoperability with existing e-conspicuity, e.g. FLARM and Pilot Aware etc..	Supported in DDP (g) Also addressed in DDP (d) The MOD supports interoperable electronic conspicuity.	No		
54			██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	We feel that the safety of all pilots can be protected by less Draconian measures: - by the use of NOTAMS covering departure and recovery periods. This works well for most pilots who now can receive updates whilst flying, or they can, in addition, still look at the published NOTAMS.	Supported in DDP (g)	No		
55			██████████	As far as the design principles are concerned, in my mind, items E, F and G are the most critical for General Aviation.	Weighting for DDP (g) noted.	No		Weighting given to (g)
56			██████████	Items f and g are not required because they are ways of achieving Item e and can be explored during the development of any potential design option via engagement with NATS and other stakeholder groups.	The MOD understands the logic, but DDP (g) is seen as important to GA, so it will remain.	No		
57			██████████	Flexible use of airspace	Supported in DDP (g)	No		
58			██████████	Examine options for interoperability with existing e-conspicuity, eg ADS-B, FLARM and PilotAware	Supported in DDP (g) The MOD supports interoperable electronic conspicuity.	No		
59	h	Use standard airspace structure where possible (Conformity, Simplicity and Safety)	██████████ ██████████	I endorse the design principles you are proposing.		No		
60			██████████	Item h it is not clear what is meant by "standard airspace structure", our inference is you mean CAS or a new Danger Area SUA etc rather than to have to invent a new type of airspace structure specifically for this operation. If the former, then we believe this is already covered by the "new item" and by modified Item e. If the latter then Item c may or may not contradict Item h (contradictions are acceptable in DP terms). This DP should be the lowest priority 4.	The MOD does not intend to invent a new airspace structure. It is felt that DDP (h) still has value since it provides confidence that it is not its intention to invent a new type of airspace. Takes lowest priority though.	No		
61								
62	Proposed new DPs	One design principle that is missing, as this ACP is for an UAV, is how your vehicle will do 'detect and avoid' should it leave controlled / protected airspace.	██████████ ██████████		This suggestion is related to the aircraft's performance capability and is, therefore, not felt to constitute an airspace design principle. However, since the concern appears to be how Protector will avoid other airspace users and/or remain in any designated airspace, it is related to DDPs (a) and (b). A Safety Assessment will be required as part of ACP to demonstrate the airspace element of this.	No		
63		A new item should be joint Priority 2 "Minimise impacts on the existing ATS route structure"	██████████		It is felt that DDP (e) supports this already. In addition, the GA community has stressed the weighting it feels should be afforded to DDP (e). Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to introduce a design principle solely to cover the ATS route structure. The MOD will engage strongly with ██████████ and the GA community to keep the impact on both bodies to a minimum.	No		
64								
65	Other		██████████	2. All sponsors must demonstrate that alternatives have been considered such as RMZ and TMZ before considering controlled airspace. 3. Class E without a TMZ should be considered as a normal option.	Not applicable to DDPs. To be covered in Stage 2	No		

Feedback Organised by Draft Design Principles

66			████	Sponsors must conduct and present proper analysis of overall airspace safety changes i.e. based on modelling and evidence rather than purely subjective opinion.	CAP 1616 process will be followed	No		
67			████	Sponsors must provide proper validation of forecast traffic levels. There is an expectation that data used, particularly forecasts, will be verifiable including details of any and all assumptions.	MOD is working on this	No		
68			████ ████ ████ ████	<p>If possible could you please answer the following few questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - will the Instrument Rated RAF pilots at Waddington have the ability to communicate with local traffic using VHF frequencies listed for Waddington or Safety Corn. <p>(I have raised the question of the RAF monitoring Safety Corn. at the L.A.U.G. on a number of occasions. The reaction has been, what is Safety Corn? Most local airfields have adopted the use of 135.480, Safety Corn.) I am aware a representative of the C.A.A. has been present at the meetings when I raised this issue. The process of safety is a joint responsibility, not just the GA sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - will the Protector be operating below 10,000 feet or will all flights be above this altitude? - the Protector flights are intended to take place over UK airspace, potentially encountering traffic at all heights below 10,000 feet. Will the Protector be able to see electronically or visually other traffic, for those not equipped with transponders, enabling the controllers to take avoiding action? - the potential controlled airspace surrounding Waddington is shown as a red circle. What are the proposed three-dimensional limitations of this zone? - I have contacted owners of small, frequently microlight Sites, who have not been been made aware of this proposal. If it is really your intention to seek local airspace users with thoughts to this, it is getting rather late to contact them. I have spoken to only owners of sites shown on the General Aviation Maps. These airfields are unknown to the R.A.F. which, as I have pointed out at L.A.U.G, are a danger to other air users. I have encountered R.A.F. aircraft flying through the circuit at Pointon and Boston. Boston is a training establishment and a student on early solo flights can be startled to encounter crossing traffic. <p>*My last question is about safety and not really related to the questions surrounding the introduction of Protectors, but I would appreciate if you could give me an answer. At the last meeting of L.A.U.G I was advised that it is possible to arrange for civil airfields to be displayed on military aviation maps but that the onus would be on small airfield to instigate this. No advice was offered as to how we should go about this. Could you please advise us how to proceed? Thank you for allowing me to respond to the proposed introduction of controlled airspace around Waddington.</p>	<p>Remaining communication from █████ was a list of questions which were not DDP-related. However, a full response was sent to the stakeholder in answer to his questions*. He also provided details of several aviation stakeholders who owned very small strips, which were not identified in the initial analysis. This occurred after the deadline for feedback. However, where email addresses were available the engagement letter was sent out inviting comment. Efforts to obtain contact details for those with telephone numbers only were made and added to the stakeholder lists for Stage 2. *Unable to provide answer to █████ last question.</p>	No		
69			████ ████ ████	The CAA Airspace Change Portal is not able to accept comments. Hence my replying to this email address. https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?pID=142	Stakeholder advised that the portal will in fact bring up an email address only. The engagement letter was potentially misleading in that it suggested feedback could be left on the portal. Apologised and made a note to reword in future.	No		
70			████ ████ ████	The introduction infers that any airspace requirement will be of a temporary nature pending certification of the Protector to fly in open FIR – this must be allowed for and an achievable timeline implemented at inception of the project for future release of any airspace activated.	Engagement letter stated the "temporary" nature of any airspace change and this was discussed in Stage 1a Assessment Meeting. It is the MOD's intention to bound the change by time in order to avoid any ACP requirement to revert. It is not felt that this decision should influence the airspace design or the design principles.	No		
71			████ ████ ████ ████	The map showing the red circle probably needs describing as to whether it is a cone increasing in size the higher the aircraft will be or a Uniform structure. Your main issue will be the CAS directly in the way which I suspect cannot be moved and as the airspace is only to be used (so I believe) until the platform has 'Sense and Avoid' its aim would be to place the aircraft into CAS – probably best to have a vertical cone above Waddington to above FL245 (to enable you to 'cross' through the TRA FL195-FL245) and enter CAS when you can proceed as a 'normal' aircraft. This would impact the least other platforms, military or civil, within Class G.	Responded explaining that the large red circle was a function of the ACP portal and not necessarily the shape of any intended airspace change. The remainder is not relevant to the DDP development.	No		
72			████ ████ ████ ████	As long as the final design remains to the south of the existing CAS L60, L603 and Y70 from southern edge of the Doncaster CTR MAMUL to at least AMVEL, I should not need to comment again.	Airspace design comments for Stage 2.	No		
73			████ ████ ████	However I would like to point out that the CAA ACP portal is unable to accept any of my comments	Stakeholder advised that the portal will in fact bring up an email address only. The engagement letter was potentially misleading in that it suggested feedback could be left on the portal. Apologised and made a note to reword in future.	No		
74			████ ████ ████	The introduction infers that any additional airspace requirement will be of a temporary nature (two years) and will end when Protector has achieved certification to allow it to fly in the open FIR. An achievable time frame must be produced when the ACP is implemented and the airspace handed back when certification is achieved.	Engagement letter stated the "temporary" nature of any airspace change and this was discussed in Stage 1a Assessment Meeting. It is the MOD's intention to bound the change by time in order to avoid any ACP requirement to revert. It is not felt that this decision should influence the airspace design or the design principles.	No		
75			████	Reiteration that the UK airspace's default classification is G	Not DP	No		
76			████	Reiteration that ICAO Class E airspace default is without the addition of a TMZ or RMZ	Not DP	No		
77			████	Efficient consultation	Not DP, but a regulatory necessity.	No		
78			████	<p>Expectation that data used, particularly forecasts, includes details of any and all assumptions and available supporting evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reasonably justified forecast traffic levels - analysis of overall airspace safety changes, ie based on modelling and evidence rather than subjective opinion 	Not DP, but the MOD acknowledges the need to follow the regulatory process as laid down in CAP1616 regarding evidence provision.	No		