

**MINUTES OF LJLA AIRSPACE TRANSITION PROJECT ASSESSMENT MEETING HELD AT
CAA HOUSE ON 28TH JUNE 2018**

4th July 2018

CAA – Attention [REDACTED] (Case Officer)

Present	Appointment	Representing
[REDACTED]	AR ¹ Case Officer (Chair)	CAA
[REDACTED]	AR Communities & Coordination	CAA
[REDACTED]	AR Communities & Coordination	CAA
[REDACTED]	AR Instrument Flight Procedures	CAA
[REDACTED]	Senior Economist Airspace	CAA
[REDACTED]	AS ² Environment & Analysis	CAA
[REDACTED]	Principal Airspace Regulator	CAA
[REDACTED]	Director ATS	ATCSL
[REDACTED]	Hd Environment (Project Manager)	LJLA
[REDACTED]	Principal Consultant	Osprey
[REDACTED]	Senior Consultant	Osprey
[REDACTED]	Senior Consultant	Osprey

CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

CAA noted that the project timeline was received in advance of the Assessment Meeting and confirmed that the documents would be published together with minutes of the meeting on the CAA website. CAA explained the purpose of the meeting and confirmed that the meeting was an Assessment Meeting and not a Gateway. The CAA reinforced that the sponsor was required to provide a broad description of their proposed approach to meeting the CAA's CAP 1616 requirements, but the CAA was not deciding whether the proposed approach met the detailed requirements of the CAA's process at this stage. The purpose of the Assessment Meeting (set out in detail in CAP 1616) was broadly:

- for the Sponsor to present and discuss their Statement of Need,
- to enable the CAA to consider whether the proposal concerned falls within the scope of the formal airspace change process,
- to enable the CAA to consider the appropriate provisional Level to assign to the change proposal.

Additionally, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to proceed to fulfil the requirements of the airspace change process and to provide information on timescales. Lastly, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to meet the engagement requirements of the various stage of the airspace change process.

	ACTION
<p>Item 1 – Introduction Following a mandatory Health and Safety briefing the Chairman welcomed all attendees and led the introductions. He read the introductory statement above and then stressed the requirement to work closely with Manchester Airport throughout the project. [REDACTED] explained that LJLA is seeking to deliver the proposed ACP</p>	

¹ Airspace Regulator.

² Airspace Specialist.

	ACTION
<p>consistently with the FASI (N) schedule. Manchester Airport has delayed its participation in FASI (N) for an uncertain period, potentially around 18-months. The Manchester Terminal Manoeuvring Area (MTMA) combined proposed ACP is still one process that will be delivered in two phases. It is anticipated that the LJLA proposed changes would have minimal impact on the GA community, as there is no identified requirement for the introduction of new airspace.</p> <p>The Chairman invited [REDACTED] to present some background slides in support of the LJLA Statement of Need previously submitted to the CAA on 8 Feb 18.</p>	
<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</p> <p>[REDACTED] presented some slides (attached) to show the broad content of the Statement of Need, (submitted on 8 Feb 18), and to help guide the discussion. The presentation highlighted the LJLA aim to integrate with the FASI (N) airports and Prestwick Air Traffic Control Centre and remain compliant with ICAO/ CAA future programmes.</p> <p>The stated objectives of the airspace change were to improve resilience and efficiency of operations at LJLA, protect capacity for future growth and seek environmental benefits within any externally imposed constraints. Supporting statistics were also briefed, as shown in the attached slides. Some additional context was introduced, including geographical location, LJLA operators and aircraft types. [REDACTED] highlighted the requirement to conduct a fleet survey to inform future design technical options. The LJLA proposed schedule is also mindful of the DVOR rationalisation programme.</p> <p>The CAA stated its specialists are content to receive draft documents ahead of the 2-week deadline for Gateway submissions. This would provide an opportunity for clarification around process requirements of each stage if required and would enable the assessment to continue on schedule.</p> <p>Regarding Step 1B (Design principle) [REDACTED] asked if the CAA had any additional guidance on the distinction between engagement and consultation, particularly with respect to this Step of the process. The intention to use a structured questionnaire to elicit responses in support of the Design Principles was deemed appropriate (in line with effective methods of engagement for Stage 1 and 2 listed in paragraph C13. of CAP1616), alongside other engagement activity, particularly recognising the role of Local Authorities (LAs) and their planning departments. [REDACTED] stated that LJLA has already engaged with the appropriate LAs to ensure they are informed of the subsequent engagement and consultation requirements; several meetings have already taken place with other airports, including Prestwick. Additionally, LJLA has informed its Airport Consultative Committee (ACC) and the Noise Monitoring sub-Committee (NMSC) of the intended changes during their regular meetings over the last 12 months.</p> <p>The CAA recognises that Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) preparation is at an early stage. It was understood that a complete list of implications and constraints may not be fully identified until later (options development) stages.</p> <p>[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] stressed that this project would be led by LJLA and not by Osprey CSL, the supporting consultancy.</p> <p>[REDACTED] asked about the use of WebTAG and sought specific direction from the CAA on the most appropriate level of engagement. [REDACTED] highlighted the recommendation</p>	<p>CAA/ Sponsor</p>

	ACTION
<p>within CAP 1616 to develop an Engagement Strategy and to maintain a log of engagement activity including all stakeholders who were engaged as part of the process, along with any responses received. This will help to inform the consultation strategy submitted at Stage 3. [redacted] stated that LJLA is eager to engage with all relevant stakeholders and recognises the distinction between engagement and a full consultation exercise. Engagement would be tailored to ensure an appropriate cross-section of stakeholder views was gathered to inform the Design Principles and Options Development Steps. [redacted] also stated it would be appropriate for Manchester Airport to conduct its engagement at the same time, but recognises that the potential 18-month Manchester delay would preclude this approach.</p> <p>[redacted] stated the importance of involving the CAA economic advisor ([redacted]). [redacted] further emphasised that the new CAP 1616 process was designed to ensure that detailed Options Appraisals would appropriately support the arguments for and against each option considered. This detail would allow design options to be compared using a consistent technique. [redacted] advised that economic benefits would be compared using WebTAG and the CAA would provide guidance to the sponsor on the use of this tool.</p> <p>[redacted] stated sponsors should follow CAP 1616 advice regarding environmental assessments as this work would be necessary to support economic assessment, and vice versa.</p> <p>[redacted] requested the CAA's view on identified stakeholders who chose not to engage with the airport at this early stage. [redacted] advised that every effort to engage should be recorded and evidence of this fact collated. [redacted] also stated that the sponsor should not expect unanimous agreement on Design Principles. Additionally when Design Options are prepared and assessed by the sponsor during later stages, clear evidence and explanations is required where the sponsor decides to declare that certain options are unviable and cannot be taken forward.</p> <p>[redacted] further advised that stakeholders have differing levels of aviation knowledge and this should be considered when preparing documentation and background information for non-aviation stakeholders.</p>	<p>CAA/ Sponsor</p> <p>Sponsor</p> <p>Sponsor</p> <p>Sponsor</p>
<p>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change The slides attached indicate the opportunities and issues identified by the sponsor. Further to the objectives identified in Item 2 above, LJLA will take the opportunity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • segregate LJLA and Manchester Airport traffic more efficiently; • capitalise on any potential environmental opportunities associated with any reductions in track mileage i.e. fewer miles flown can reduce aircraft fuel burn (reduced CO₂ emissions and lower impact on air quality) ; • facilitate continuous climbs and descents, thus minimising noise impacts; • ensure a more efficient interface with the en-route airways structure and adjacent airports and, in combination, an overall reduction in ground and air delays for the benefit of operators and fare-paying passengers. <p>The main issues identified were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the coordination of LJLA airspace changes against the other northern UK airspace changes; • the programmed removal of ground-based navigation aids that support LJLA extant conventional procedures; and • the constraints imposed by other northern airspace control centres and airports. 	

	ACTION
<p>Item 4 – Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified</p> <p>Nil identified at this stage.</p>	
<p>Item 5 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements</p> <p>█ confirmed that the proposed airspace change fell within the requirements of CAP 1616 and at this stage was provisionally considered to be a CAP 1616 Level 1 project.</p> <p>The Level 1 category would be confirmed at the end of Stage 2, following the Develop and Assess Gateway.</p>	CAA
<p>Item 6 – Provisional process timescales</p> <p>Provisional timescales were provided to the CAA prior to the Assessment Meeting. The key timescales for the CAA align to the CAP 1616 process gateways; these are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define Gateway 31 August 2018 • Develop & Assess Gateway 30 November 2018 • Consult Gateway 25 January 2019 • Decide Gateway 28 February 2020 <p>At this stage, the planned timescales for the anticipated 132-week project were provided in the High-Level plan (attached within slides) and tabled as a hard-copy. This shows a current target date of 20 Mar 20 for the submission of the changes to NATS AIS for publication on 16 Jul 20.</p> <p>The Chairman reiterated the requirement to keep the CAA informed (through █ – Principal Airspace Regulator) of any changes to the anticipated timescales above.</p>	Sponsor
<p>Item 7 – IFP Validation (Flyability Assessment)</p> <p>During the meeting █ asked for clarification on the reference to ID 64 “live flight trial” in the project plan chart. █ explained that it should be the validation of the IFPs. █ explained a validation plan would need to be submitted to the IFP section for approval, prior to any validation tasks taking place in a simulator and/or aircraft.</p>	Sponsor
<p>Item 8 – Next steps</p> <p>Development of Design Principles In accordance with CAP 1616, Step 1B.</p>	Sponsor
<p>Item 9 – Any other business</p> <p>Nil</p>	

ACTIONS ARISING FROM LJLA AIRSPACE TRANSITION PROJECT ASSESSMENT MEETING

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Minutes	[REDACTED]	Produce Minutes of meeting for publication	12 Jul 18
Confirmation	[REDACTED]	Write to CAA to confirm intention to proceed with proposal development	20 Jul 18

[REDACTED] Dir ATS, LJLA
ACP Sponsor