| Cardiff Airport Airspace Change Process (CAP1616) | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|------------------------------------|-------|------------|-----|--|------------|
| DESIGN PRINCIPLES QUESTIONNAIRE | | | - | _ | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Name | Role/title | Organisation | Email | Category | DP0 | DP0 comment | DP1 |
| | | South Wales Police | | Community | | 1 | 1 |
| | | Llandow Community Council | | Community | | 3 | 2 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | St Fagans Community Council | | Community | | 1 Ongoing discussion when capacity increases | 1 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | NERL | | Aviation | | 1 | |
| | | Caerdav | | Aviation | | 1 Include strategy and mitigation. | 2 |
| | | Serco | | Aviation | | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Cardiff Heliport | | Aviation | | 1 | 2 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Consideration of risk that may be associated and the | |
| | | Horizon Flight Training | | Aviation | | 1 mitigation | 1 |
| | | Dragonfly Executive Aviation | | Aviation | | 1 | 1 |
| | | Exeter Airport | | Aviation | | 1 | 2 |
| | | | | , () (0 () | | - | _ |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Welsh Government | | Aviation | | 1 | 2 |
| | | Weish Government | | /(viation | | - | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Bristol Airport | | Aviation | | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | Aviation | | Safety consideration must include all aircraft | |
| | | | | | | affected by aircrace. Effective choice points aircraft | |
| | | RMAA (Reporting to $IAA/AAA/GAA$) | | Aviation | | 1 types upable to comply with ATC | |
| | | BINAA (Reporting to LAA) A4A/ GAA) | | Aviation | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | DAE | | Aviation | | 1 | 2 |
| | | KAF | | Aviation | | | 2 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Facilit | | Aviation | | 1 Safety underning the entire proposal | 1 |
| | | Easyjet | | Aviation | | | 1 <u>1</u> |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | NATS | | Aviation | | - | |
| | | | | Aviation | | J Elovibility and cimplicity kou to this. Sofo protoction | 5 |
| | | | | | | of IEP traffic may protection VEP. Safety applies to | |
| | | LINALAS MOD St Athan | | Aviation | | 1 all DBc | |
| | | UWAS, WOD STALIIAII | | Aviation | | | 2 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 4004 | | Aviation | | 1 No change proposed should DEDUCE seferi | 1 |
| | | AUPA | | Aviation | | Into change proposed should REDUCE safety. | |
| | | Gliding Clubs [South Wales / Black | | A | | | |
| | | iviountainsj | | Aviation | | <u>1</u> | 1 |

| | | making sure things are safe as a whole for everyone | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---|---|
| Aeros Flight Training | Aviation | 1 instead of assessing individual proposals. | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | Safety is paramount to all aircraft operations so | |
| Cowbridge Town Council | Community | 1 enhancing current levels is key. | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Clayton Hotel Cardiff / Cardiff | | | - |
| Hoteliers Association | Community | 1 | 2 |
| Vale Tourism Association | Community | 1 | 1 |
| | | Opportunity to further enhance safety rather than | |
| Cardiff and Vale College | Community | 1 maintain current level | 1 |
| | Community | | 1 |
| | | | |
| Cardiff Airport Disabilities Board | Community | 1 | 1 |
| · | , , | | |
| St Athan UK SAR Base, Bristow | | This should underpin every other DP, rather than be | |
| Helicopters Ltd | Aviation | 1 considered as a DP in its own right. | 2 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Global Trek Aviation | Aviation | 1 | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | No additional information to what was provided at | |
| Penarth Town Council | Community | 1 the 17/1/20 workshop. | 1 |
| | | 1 Kouto all alamanta halaw | 1 |

| 1 | 93% |
|--------|----------|
| 2 | 0% |
| 3 | 3% |
| 4 | 0% |
| 5 | 3% |
| | |
| 1 | 93% |
| 2 | 0% |
| 3 | 3% |
| | |
| 4 | 0% |
| 4 5 | 0% 3% |

63% 33% 0% 4% 63% 33% 0% 0% 4%

| DP1 comment | DP2 | DP2 comment | DP3 | DP3 comment | DP4 |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|----------|
| | 2 | | 2 | | 1 |
| | 2 | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | | Cardiff Airport is a business and should be run | |
| Common sense | 1 | This would seem to fall in line in growth figures | 1 | accordingly irrespective of Welsh Gov | 1 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 2 | | 2 | | 2 |
| | 2 | | 2 | | 1 |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 1 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 2 | Nothing in this should affect DP1 | 3 | Nothing in this should affect DP1 & DP2 | 1 |
| | | Take into account the effect of automation and | | | |
| | | ensuring it is monitored and has a substantial | | | |
| Consideration again of risk | 1 | amount of redundancy. | 2 | | 2 |
| | 2 | | 2 | | 2 |
| | 2 | | 3 | | 3 |
| | | It must be designed for growth. Difficult because | | | |
| | | of the balance between markets driving | | | |
| | | development up and down but has to be a core | | | |
| | 1 | principle. | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |
| | | | | | |
| Simplicity of design will reduce pilot ATC | | Use minimum classification of airspace. Consider | | | |
| workload. | 1 | benefits of FUA and future EC solutions. | | No comment. | 3 |
| | | | | Dath ICD and UCD needs should be sensidered within | |
| | | | | Both IFR and OFR needs should be considered within | |
| | 2 | | 2 | this principle and adequately balanced. | |
| Additional to ATC operators' OP should be taken | | | | | |
| into account | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 3 | | 4 | | |
| | | | | | <u> </u> |
| | | | | | |
| ATC and Users. | 2 | Provided no change compromises DP1 above | 3 | Provided no change compromises DP 1 or 2 above | 2 |
| | | | | | |
| | 2 | | 3 | | 4 |

| resilience for airspace users as well as ATC is | | | | burn but ensuring ATC can still route around using | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| equally important. | 1 | Capacity for both IFR and UFR traffic. | 1 | elbows. | 1 |
| While I accept that there will be breakdown, design of the system should minimise this effect. | 1 | | 1 | Economic performance should take into account environmental consideration. | 1 |
| | 2 | Unsure of word 'greatest', may lead to trade off from other area such as safety or environmental. Increase capacity is essential for future of Cardiff as a whole. | | | 1 |
| | 2 | | 1 | | 1 |
| | 2 | Needs consideration of other elements, noise, pollution etc. Capacity v community effect. | 1 | | 1 |
| | 3 | To maximise Cardiff's economic benefit whilst still working with Bristol. | 1 | If we optimise fuel mileage burn it should encourage more carriers and local economy. | 1 |
| DPs 1-3 should be considered as in order of priority (so DP2 must not impinge on DP1 etc) | 2 | | 2 | | 3 |
| | 1 | The requirement to maintain but preferably increase capacity for IFR training capacity. | 2 | | 2 |
| | | | | | |
| As above comment. | 2 | | 2 | | 1 |
| | 2 | | 1 | | 1 |

| 41% | 59% |
|-----|--|
| 37% | 21% |
| 15% | 10% |
| 7% | 7% |
| 0% | 3% |
| | |
| 41% | 59% |
| 37% | 21% |
| 15% | 10% |
| 7% | 7% |
| 0% | 3% |
| | 41% 37% 15% 7% 0% 41% 37% 15% 7% 0% |

| DP4 comment | DP5 | DP5 comment | DP6 |
|--|-------------|--|----------|
| | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| | 1 | Ĺ | 2 |
| | | | |
| Very important | 1 | Liaison with local institutions which I assume will take place | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | Caution with words such as reduce . Also the last 2 pullet points shouldnit | 2 |
| | | | <u> </u> |
| | | | 3 |
| | | | |
| The "CO2" should be reworded as all emissions including NOX | | | |
| should be included | 1 | This should be included with DP4 with "environmental" | 2 |
| | <u> </u> | | |
| | | | |
| | 2 | ² Consideration of this should not have an impact on flight safety. | 1 |
| | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| All' emissions. | | Avoid using 'over parks' - shared facilities, communities will be affected. | 3 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | 2 | | 3 |
| | <u></u> | · | |
| Create airspace which benefits modern aircraft. Do not cater | | | |
| for lowest standards. | 3 | 3 | |
| | | | |
| Equally important for all aircraft operators but consideration | | | |
| should be given to high polluters in the first instance. | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | If you maximise use of PBN + facilitate minimisation of CO2/emissions, the | |
| | 2 | noise issue from airline operators should naturally follow. | 3 |
| | | | |
| "Fuel concumption" to be additional to "CO2 omissions" | , | | |
| | | | <u> </u> |
| | | | |
| | 2 | More route inbound/outbound flexibility. | |
| | | | |
| | | Dispersion should not be compromised by minimising new people. Share | |
| | 2 | the noise. | 2 |
| | | | |
| | 3 | 3 | 3 |

| can be put to 3.5 degrees therefore reducing power and fuel | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| (noise as well). | 1 | Same comment as DP4. | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | Accepted that not all of the above are mutually compatible and it may be | |
| Climate change legislation will probably drive this. | 1 | necessary to 'share the grief' | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | Cardiff Airport is currently not as disruptive. Should be higher priority as | |
| Should promote the reduction. | 1 | flights increase to maximum levels. | 3 |
| | 1 | | 2 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Should be stronger than 'facilitate' e.g. targets and incentives. | 2 | Managed dispersal in consideration of highly populated areas. | 1 |
| | | | |
| Because Cardiff Airport is sponsored by Government it should | | | |
| always look to reduce wider impact. | 3 | | 2 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| This should be a positive by-product of achieving DPs 1-3 | 4 | Considerations should be given to varying the routes of VFR | 2 |
| | | Consideration to be made that park and some spaces should be avoided | |
| | | where possible as it can cause annoyance to those who choose to use said | |
| | 2 | areas to relax. | 2 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | This needs fleshing out in your public consultation in order for specific | |
| | 1 | geographic areas, with different needs, can be considered. | 2 |
| Key to climate damage. | 1 | | 2 |

| 34% | 25% |
|-----|-----|
| 34% | 46% |
| 24% | 25% |
| 7% | 4% |
| 0% | 0% |
| 34% | 25% |
| 34% | 46% |
| 24% | 25% |
| 7% | 4% |
| 0% | 0% |
| | |

| DP6 comment | DP7 | DP7 comment | DP8 | DP8 comment | DP9 |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|-----|
| | 2 | | 2 | | 2 |
| | 2 | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | | | Only the minimum if that is the case. Growth is not a rude | |
| Common sense | 1 | | 1 | word. | 1 |
| | | | | | |
| | | Should have similar wording to DP6 in order to align GA and | | | |
| Should have similar wording to DP7. | з | MOD requirements/expectations. | | | |
| Use of 'endeavour' not applicable | 2 | | 2 | | 2 |
| | 2 | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Instead of "will endeavour to" input "shall" | 2 | Remove "should", include "shall" | | All UK Airspace users | 1 |
| | | | | | |
| As operators at St Athan we feel this should be and not just consider (endeavour). Needs | | | | | |
| to be possibly reworded. | 1 | | 2 | | 2 |
| | 2 | | 3 | | 2 |
| | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Locally this is not an issue | | | | | |
| where MOD priorities would be above usual OPS. | 2 | | 1 | | 2 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1 |
| | | | | | |
| | | All airspace users must be considered as valid users of | | Add "all" airspace users (the needs of ALL UK airspace | |
| No comment. | 1 | airspace. | 1 | users). | 1 |
| | | | | This is important to maximise MOD operations. Differing | |
| Remove the word 'endeavour' from this design principle. A compatible agreement | | | | airspace classifications for CAS should be considered to | |
| should be reached. | 3 | | 1 | maximise VFR operations. | 4 |
| | | | | | |
| Important to consider all users, from a commercial perspective, this is not overly our | | | | | |
| concern. | 2 | | 2 | | 1 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 3 | | 4 | | 4 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Endeavour to read shall. | 1 | Opportunity to enhance but words suggest otherwise. | 1 | Specific wording should include 'local users'. | 3 |
| | | | | | |
| Add DP6.5 Blue light services | - | | - | | |
| Change "will endeavour" to "shall" | 2 | Change will to shall | 2 | | 1 |
| | | | | | |
| | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |

| Ensuring compatibility with all airspace users is critical. Nothing should be implemented | of the equation. Perhaps removing unneeded CA will me | an Minimum for a comfortable operation as well as in an | |
|---|--|--|---|
| to change this. | 1 more efficient usage for GA. | 1 emergency. | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| No contention! | 1 Need to operate (within reason) with other airspace user | rs. 1 | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | The word minimum from the perspective of the GA | | |
| | community would not be acceptable. Minimum is | | |
| | 1 subjective. | 1 | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | It should be minimal, but with an eye to future needs | |
| This needs to be maintained for UK security. | 2 | 3 rather than current requirements. | 1 |
| Either included in this DP or as a standalone DP, the needs of Blue light aviation should | | Maximising the availability of airspace to VFR users reduces | |
| be included. The proposal should not reduce the flexibility of such aircraft to transit | | transit times, holding etc. making operations more CO2 | |
| controlled airspace as quickly as possible. | 3 | 2 efficient. | 2 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| May depend on the future of MOD in St Athan eg in 2010 DTC was cancelled - will St | | | |
| Athan increase or decrease in the future? | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| | 2 | 3 | 2 |

| 34% | 41% | |
|-----|-----|--|
| 45% | 33% | |
| 21% | 22% | |
| 0% | 4% | |
| 0% | 0% | |
| | | |
| 34% | 41% | |
| 45% | 33% | |
| 21% | 22% | |
| 0% | 4% | |
| 0% | 0% | |

46% 39% 7% 7% 0% 46%

39% 7% 7% 0%

| DP9 comment | DP10 | DP10 comment | DP11 | DP11 comment |
|---|------|---|------|----------------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | | |
| | | 1 Common sense | 1 | We need a compet |
| | | | | |
| | | | | Great opportunity |
| | | 1 Should be more generic than just PBN IR. Cover all regulatory issues. | 1 | airspace should inc |
| | | 2 Consider users that do not hold PBN. | 2 | 2 |
| | | 1 | 1 | L |
| | | | | |
| The benefits should outweigh legacy needs. Allowances should be | | | | |
| built in to allow for the older a/c until they are staffed. | | 2 Reword PBNIR & replace with regulatory requirements. | 3 | \$ |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Consideration of non GNSS aircraft. | | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 1 | L |
| | | 2 | 1 | L |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | 2 | 1 | L |
| | | | | |
| | | | | Designs utilising mo |
| | | | | environment with t |
| | | 1 | 1 | economic benefits |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| This can lead to minimum airspace. | | 1 As DP9. | 1 | Other airspace user |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| As a design principle, this will offer maximum benefits. | | 1 | 1 | Seamless integration |
| | | | | |
| | | | | "Airspace should" - |
| | | 4 | 5 | airspace belonging |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | 3 | 1 | To work to specific |
| | | | | |
| | | | | Include airfields in |
| Whole basis for design | | 1 Whole basis for design | 2 | name |
| | | | | |
| | | 2 | 2 | Maximise controlle |
| | | | | |

| • | | | |
|-------|-----|----|------|
| -11/0 | | mo | nt |
| | CIC | ше | IIL. |
| | | | |

to work together with Bristol to develop an efficient clude network connectivity and probably Exeter.

odern aircraft technology will create auto-operating the capability to provide noise, environmental and to all airspace users and airport neighbours

rs should not be disadvantaged.

on with other airports (BRS) to allow benefit to users.

does this mean "access to airspace" or the actual to Cardiff that is **delegated** to Bristol?

airfield operations.

or under proposed airspace eg Cardiff Helicopter by

ed airspace to the south i.e. over water.

| We need to be developing airspace for the future. Not for those | | Make the airspace for the future. Previous airspace was developed using 1950's | | |
|--|---|--|---|----------------------|
| who want to remain in the past! | 1 | tech. | 1 | |
| · | | | | |
| | | | | |
| The best possible use should be made of the available technology. | 1 | As above. | 1 | Need to maintain a |
| | | | | |
| Should be ahead of PBN not comply just due to legislations - leaders | | | | |
| in field pre-empt pext stage. Next 50+ years | 1 | Stav ahead of legislation | | Essential for future |
| in neid pre empt next stage. Next sof years. | 2 | | 2 | |
| | E | | - | |
| | | | | |
| Suggest optimum rather than maximum. | 1 | | 1 | |
| | | | | We should ensure t |
| As long as appropriate backups exist to support the failure of these | | | | given that public pe |
| systems. | 1 | | 3 | important) |
| | | | | |
| | | | | Obviously autonom |
| | 2 | | 3 | overlapping airspac |
| | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | |
| | 1 | | 3 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 1 | | 1 | |
| Resilience was raised along with maintaining resilience. | 2 | | 2 | |

| 52% | 50% | |
|-----|-----|--|
| 38% | 29% | |
| 7% | 14% | |
| 3% | 4% | |
| 0% | 4% | |
| 52% | 50% | |
| 38% | 29% | |
| 7% | 14% | |
| | | |
| 3% | 4% | |

| and | working | rolationchin | i+h | naighbourg |
|------|---------|--------------|-------|-------------|
| 2000 | WOLKIUS | relationship | WILLI | neignbours. |
| 0 | | | | |

and operational requirements.

that fair and equitable arrangements can be reached erception is that Bristol is larger (or possibly more

ny should be afforded to satellite airfields with ce requirements.

| Additional/alternative DPs | Comments on engagement process |
|--|---|
| | |
| | |
| | Very efficient. |
| | Excellent facilitation. Great cross-section of the stakeholder community. |
| | |
| | |
| | Very useful and looking forward to consulting recap. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | Excellent event, thank you, Well presented and well facilitated. |
| | |
| | |
| As supplied in advance by BMAA and GAA. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| DP5.5 - Emergency Services. If DP0 is phrased as a negative - nothing in these proposals should reduce safety. | Thanks - good productive day. |
| | |

| | Very interesting and worthwhile meeting. |
|---|--|
| | |
| | |
| Impact on ground?? | Very informative, nice to be asked to engage. |
| | Well conducted, enjoyably constructive. |
| | |
| Consideration for infrastructure improvements to support optimised airspace. | More info about expected contribution would have been beneficial. |
| | We did not receive the joining instructions or the issues to be |
| I would like to see Cardiff Airport using this to build their business case for | discussed. I would have been better served by the Aviators |
| expansion | workshop. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | Being non-technical and having no expert knowledge of the aviation |
| | industry it was challenging to delve into some specific aspects of the |
| | DPs. However, I welcome more/further/future communication on |
| | the ASCP. |
| | |



Cardiff Airport Airspace Change Process (CAP1616) DESIGN PRINCIPLES QUESTIONNAIRE

| lame | Role/title | Organisation |
|------|------------|------------------------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | NERL |
| | | Caerday |
| | | Serco |
| | | 56100 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | Cardiff Heliport |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | Horizon Flight Training |
| | | Dragonfly Executive Aviation |
| | | Exeter Airport |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | Welsh Government |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | Pristal Airport |
| | | Blistol Aliport |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | BMAA (Reporting to LAA/A4A/GAA) |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | RAF |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | Easyjet |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | NATS |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | UWAS, MOD St Athan |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | AUFA |
| | | Gliuing Clubs (South Wales / Black |
| | | Mountainsj |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | Aeros Flight Training |
| | | |



| Email | Category | DP0 |
|-------|----------|----------|
| | | |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | | |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | | |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | Aviation | <u>+</u> |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | | |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | | |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | Aviation | 5 |
| | | |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | | |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | Aviation | 1 |
| | | |
| | Aviation | 1 |

| Aviation | 1 |
|------------|-----|
| , what lot | |
| | |
| Aviation | 1 |
| 1 | 95% |
| 2 | 0% |
| 3 | 0% |
| 4 | 0% |
| 5 | 5% |
| • | |
| 1 | 95% |
| 2 | 0% |
| 3 | 0% |
| 4 | 0% |
| 5 | 5% |

| DP0 comment | DP1 |
|---|-----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Include strategy and mitigation. | 2 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| Consideration of risk that may be associated and the | |
| mitigation | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| Safety consideration must include all aircraft | |
| affected by airspace. Effective choice points, aircraft | |
| types unable to comply with ATC. | |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| Safety underpins the entire proposal. | 1 |
| | |
| | - |
| Elevibility and simplicity key to this. Safe protection | 5 |
| of IER traffic may protection VER Safety applies to | |
| all DPs | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| No change proposed should REDUCE safety. | 1 |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| There is a certain element of risk in everything so | |
| making sure things are safe as a whole for everyone | |
| Instead of assessing individual proposals. | 1 |

| This should underpin every other DP. rather than be | |
|---|-------------|
| considered as a DP in its own right. | 2 |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | · · · · · · |

53% 41% 0% 6% 53% 41% 0%

| DP1 comment | DP2 |
|---|-----|
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| Consideration again of risk | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| Simplicity of design will reduce pilot ATC | |
| workload. | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| Additional to ATC operators' OP should be taken | |
| into account | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 4 |
| | |
| | |
| | 3 |
| | |
| ATC and Users | 2 |
| | Z |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| Resilience to ATC is important but ensuring | |
| resilience for airspace users as well as ATC is | |
| equally important. | 1 |

| DPs 1-3 should be considered as in order of | |
|---|---|
| priority (so DP2 must not impinge on DP1 etc) | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |

| 42% |
|-------------|
| 47% |
| 5% |
| 5% |
| 0% |
| |
| 42% |
| 47% |
| 5% |
| E 0/ |

| DP2 comment | DP3 |
|---|-----|
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| Nothing in this should affect DP1 | 3 |
| Take into account the effect of automation and | |
| ensuring it is monitored and has a substantial | |
| amount of redundancy. | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| It must be designed for growth. Difficult because | |
| of the balance between markets driving | |
| development up and down but has to be a core | |
| principle | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| Use minimum classification of aircnase. Consider | |
| benefits of ELLA and future EC solutions | |
| benefits of FOA and future EC solutions. | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | Ζ |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 4 |
| | |
| | |
| | 4 |
| | |
| | |
| Provided no change compromises DP1 above. | 3 |
| | |
| | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Capacity for both IFR and UFR traffic. | 1 |

| 2 |
|---|
| |
| |
| 2 |
| |

| 22% |
|--------------------------|
| 44% |
| 22% |
| 11% |
| 0% |
| |
| |
| 22% |
| 22% 44% |
| 22% 44% 22% |
| 22% 44% 22% 11% |

| DP3 comment | DP4 |
|--|-----|
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| Nothing in this should affect DD1 8 DD2 | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| No comment. | 3 |
| | |
| Both IFR and UFR needs should be considered within | 1 |
| this principle and adequately balanced. | I |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 4 |
| | |
| | |
| | 5 |
| | |
| | |
| Provided no change compromises DP 1 or 2 above. | 2 |
| | |
| | 4 |
| | |
| Implementation of PBN with CDA's will improve fuel | |
| burn but ensuring ATC can still route around using | |
| eidows. | 1 |

| _ |
|---|
| 2 |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| - |
| 7 |
| Z |
| |

37% 32% 16% 11% 5% 37% 32% 16% 11% 5%

| DP4 comment | DP5 |
|--|-----|
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| The "CO2" should be reworded as all emissions including NOX | |
| should be included | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| All' emissions. | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| Create airspace which henefits modern aircraft. Do not cater | |
| for lowest standards | 3 |
| | |
| Equally important for all aircraft operators but consideration | |
| should be given to high polluters in the first instance. | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| "Fuel consumption" to be additional to "CO2 emissions" | 4 |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | Z |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | 3 |
| | |
| Reduction of environmental impact is vital. PBN glidestones | |
| can be put to 3.5 degrees therefore reducing power and fuel | |
| (noise as well). | 1 |

| This should be a positive by-product of achieving DPs 1-3 | 4 |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |

16% 47% 26% 11% 0% 16% 47% 26%

| DP5 comment | DP6 |
|--|-----|
| | |
| Caution with words such as 'reduce'. Also the last 2 bullet points shouldn't | |
| be included in a DP. | 3 |
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| This should be included with DP4 with "environmental" | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| Consideration of this should not have an impact on flight safety. | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | 4 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Avoid using 'over parks' - shared facilities, communities will be affected. | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | 1 |
| If you maximise use of PBN + facilitate minimisation of CO2/emissions, the | |
| noise issue from airline operators should naturally follow. | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| More route inbound/outbound flexibility. | 1 |
| | |
| Dispersion should not be compromised by minimising new people. Share | |
| the noise. | 2 |
| | |
| | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Same comment as DP4. | 1 1 |

| Considerations should be given to varying the routes of VFR | 2 |
|--|---|
| Consideration to be made that park and some spaces should be avoided | |
| where possible as it can cause annoyance to those who choose to use said | |
| areas to relax. | 2 |

| 22% |
|-----|
| 39% |
| 33% |
| 6% |
| 0% |
| |
| 22% |
| 39% |
| 33% |
| |

| Should have similar wording to DP7. | 3 |
|---|--------|
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | |
| Instead of "will endeavour to" input "shall" | 2 |
| | |
| As operators at St Athan we feel this should be and not just consider (endeavour). Needs | |
| to be possibly reworded. | 1 |
| | 2 1 |
| | |
| | |
| Locally this is not an issue | |
| where MOD priorities would be above usual OPS. | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| No comment. | 1 |
| | _ |
| Remove the word 'endeavour' from this design principle. A compatible agreement | |
| should be reached. | 3 |
| | |
| Important to consider all users, from a commercial perspective, this is not overly our | |
| concern. | 2 |
| | |
| | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| Endeavour to read shall. | 1 |
| | |
| Add DP6.5 Blue light services | |
| Change "will endeavour" to "shall" | 2 |
| | 1 |
| | I |
| | |
| Ensuring compatibility with all airspace users is critical. Nothing should be implemented | |
| to change this. | 1 |

| Either included in this DP or as a standalone DP, the needs of Blue light aviation should | |
|---|---|
| be included. The proposal should not reduce the flexibility of such aircraft to transit | |
| controlled airspace as quickly as possible. | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |

37%

42% 21%

0% 0%

37% 42%

21%

| DP7 comment | DP8 |
|--|-----|
| | |
| Should have similar wording to DP6 in order to align GA and | |
| MOD requirements/expectations. | |
| | 2 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| Pomovo "should", includo "shall" | |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| All simples were must be sensidered as welld were af | |
| All all space users must be considered as valid users of | 1 |
| an space. | ł |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | 4 |
| | |
| | |
| Opportunity to enhance but words suggest otherwise. | 1 |
| | |
| Change will to shall | 2 |
| | Z |
| | 1 |
| | |
| Efficient airspace will also mean not pushing GA traffic out | |
| of the equation. Perhaps removing unneeded CA will mean | |
| more efficient usage for GA. | 1 |

| 2 |
|---|
| |
| 3 |

47% 35% 12% 6% 0% 47% 35% 12% 6% 0%

| DP8 comment | DP9 |
|--|-----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | 1 |
| All OK Allspace users | ± |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| Add all airspace users (the needs of ALL OK airspace | 1 |
| This is important to maximise MOD operations. Differing | ± |
| airspace classifications for CAS should be considered to | |
| maximise VFR operations. | 4 |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 4 |
| | |
| | |
| Specific wording should include 'local users'. | 3 |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | |
| Minimum for a comfortable operation as well as in an | |
| emergency. | 1 |

| Maximising the availability of airspace to VFR users reduces | |
|--|---|
| transit times, holding etc. making operations more CO2 | |
| efficient. | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | 3 |

39% 39% 11% 0% 39% 39% 11% 11% 0%

| DP9 comment | DP10 |
|--|------|
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | 1 |
| | 1 |
| The henefits should outwaigh logagy people. Allowances should be | |
| huilt in to allow for the older o (o until they are staffed | |
| built in to allow for the older a/c until they are staffed. | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| Consideration of non GNSS aircraft. | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| This can lead to minimum airspace. | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| As a design principle, this will offer maximum benefits. | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 4 |
| | · |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| Whole basis for design | 1 |
| | |
| | _ |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| We need to be developing airspace for the future. Not for those | |
| who want to remain in the past! | 1 |
| | |

| 2 |
|---|
| |
| 1 |

42%

42% 11%

5%

0%

42%

42%

11% 5%

| DP10 comment | DP11 |
|---|------|
| | |
| | 1 |
| Should be more generic than just PBN IR. Cover all regulatory issues. | 1 |
| Consider users that do not hold PBN. | 2 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| Reword PBNIR & replace with regulatory requirements | 3 |
| | 5 |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| As DP9. | 1 |
| | |
| | л |
| | 4 |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 5 |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| Whole basis for design | 2 |
| | _ |
| | 2 |
| | |
| Make the aircrase for the future. Providus aircrase was developed using 10501 | |
| tech | 1 |
| | |

| 3 |
|---|
| |
| 3 |

53% 21% 16% 5% 5% 53% 21% 16%

> 5% 5%

DP11 comment

Great opportunity to work together with Bristol to develop an efficient airspace should include network connectivity and probably Exeter.

Designs utilising modern aircraft technology will create auto-operating environment with the capability to provide noise, environmental and economic benefits to all airspace users and airport neighbours

Other airspace users should not be disadvantaged.

Seamless integration with other airports (BRS) to allow benefit to users.

"Airspace should" - does this mean "access to airspace" or the actual airspace belonging to Cardiff that is **delegated** to Bristol?

To work to specific airfield operations.

Include airfields in or under proposed airspace eg Cardiff Helicopter by name

Maximise controlled airspace to the south i.e. over water.

Obviously autonomy should be afforded to satellite airfields with overlapping airspace requirements.

| Additional/alternative DPs |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| As supplied in advance by DNAAA and CAA |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| DP5 5 - Emergency Services |
| If DDO is phrased as a pogative pothing in these proposals should reduce |
| In DPO is prinased as a negative - nothing in these proposals should reduce |
| Salety. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

| Comments on e | ngagement process |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Excellent facilita community. | tion. Great cross-section of the stakeholder |
| | |
| | |
| Very useful and | looking forward to consulting recap. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Excellent event, | thank you. Well presented and well facilitated. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Thanks - good p | roductive day. |
| | |
| | |



Cardiff Airport Airspace Change Process (CAP1616) DESIGN PRINCIPLES QUESTIONNAIRE

| Name | Role/title | Organisation | Email | Category |
|------|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | South Wales Police | | Community |
| | | Llandow Community Council | | Community |
| | | | | |
| | | St Fagans Community Council | | Community |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | Cowbridge Town Council | | Community |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | Clayton Hotel Cardiff / Cardiff | | |
| | | Hoteliers Association | | Community |
| | | Vale Tourism Association | | Community |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | Cardiff and Vale College | | Community |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | Cardiff Airport Disabilities Board | | Community |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | Penarth Town Council | | Community |
| | | Vale of Glamorgan Council | | Community |

| DP0 | DP0 comment | DP1 |
|-----|---|-----|
| 1 | | 1 |
| 3 | | 2 |
| | | |
| 1 | Ongoing discussion when capacity increases | 1 |
| | Safety is paramount to all aircraft operations so | |
| 1 | enhancing current levels is key. | 1 |
| | | |
| 1 | | 2 |
| 1 | | 1 |
| 1 | Opportunity to further enhance safety rather than maintain current level. | 1 |
| 1 | | 1 |
| | | |
| | No additional information to what was provided at | |
| 1 | the 17/1/20 workshop. | 1 |
| 1 | Key to all elements below. | 1 |

| 90% | 80% |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 0% | 20% |
| 10% | 0% |
| 0% | 0% |
| 0% | 0% |
| | |
| 90% | 80% |
| | |
| 0% | 20% |
| 0% 10% | 20% 0% |
| 0% 10% 0% | 20% 0% 0% |
| 0% 10% 0% 0% | 20% 0% 0% 0% |

| DP1 comment | DP2 |
|---|-----|
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | |
| Common sense | 1 |
| | |
| While I accept that there will be breakdown, | |
| design of the system should minimise this effect. | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| As above comment. | 2 |
| | 2 |

| 20% |
|-------------------------|
| 70% |
| 10% |
| 0% |
| 0% |
| |
| |
| 20% |
| 20% 70% |
| 20% 70% 10% |
| 20% 70% 10% 0% |

| DP2 comment | DP3 |
|---|-----|
| | 2 |
| | 1 |
| This would seem to fall in line in growth figures | 1 |
| | 1 |
| Unsure of word 'greatest', may lead to trade off from other area such as safety or environmental. Increase capacity is essential for future of Cardiff as a whole. | |
| | 1 |
| Needs consideration of other elements, noise, pollution etc. Capacity v community effect. | 1 |
| To maximise Cardiff's economic benefit whilst still working with Bristol. | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | 1 |

| 78% |
|------------------------------|
| 22% |
| 0% |
| 0% |
| 0% |
| |
| |
| 78% |
| 78% 22% |
| 78% 22% 0% |
| 78% 22% 0% 0% |
| 78% 22% 0% 0% 0% |

| DP3 comment | DP4 |
|---|-----|
| | 1 |
| | 1 |
| Cardiff Airport is a business and should be run | |
| accordingly irrespective of Welsh Gov | 1 |
| Economic performance should take into account environmental consideration. | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | 1 |
| If we optimise fuel mileage burn it should encourage more carriers and local economy. | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | 1 |

100% 0% 0% 0% 100% 0% 0%

| DP4 comment | DP5 |
|--|-----|
| | 3 |
| | 1 |
| Very important | 1 |
| | 1 |
| Climate change legislation will probably drive this. | 1 |
| | |
| Should promote the reduction. | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| Should be stronger than 'facilitate' e.g. targets and incentives. | 2 |
| Because Cardiff Airport is sponsored by Government it should always look to reduce wider impact. | 3 |
| | |
| Key to climate damage. | 1 |

70% 10% 20% 0% 0%

70% 10% 20% 0%

| DP5 comment | DP6 |
|---|-----|
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| Liaison with local institutions which I assume will take place | 1 |
| Accepted that not all of the above are mutually compatible and it may be necessary to 'share the grief' | 1 |
| Cardiff Airport is currently not as disruptive. Should be higher priority as | |
| flights increase to maximum levels. | 3 |
| | 2 |
| Managed dispersal in consideration of highly populated areas. | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | |
| This needs fleshing out in your public consultation in order for specific | |
| geographic areas, with different needs, can be considered. | 2 |
| | 2 |

30% 60% 10% 0% 30% 60% 10% 0%

| DP6 comment | DP7 |
|--|-----|
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| Common sense | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| No contention! | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 3 |
| | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| This needs to be maintained for UK security. | 2 |
| | |
| | |
| May depend on the future of MOD in St Athan eg in 2010 DTC was cancelled - will St | |
| Athan increase or decrease in the future? | 3 |
| | 2 |

30% 50%

20%

0% 0%

30% 50%

20%

0%

| DP7 comment | DP8 |
|--|-----|
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | 1 |
| Need to operate (within reason) with other airspace users. | 1 |
| | 3 |
| | 2 |
| The word minimum from the perspective of the GA | |
| subjective. | 1 |
| | 3 |
| | |
| | 3 |
| | 1 3 |

30% 30% 40% 0% 0% 30% 40% 0%

| Only the minimum if that is the case. Growth is not a rude word. | |
|---|---|
| Only the minimum if that is the case. Growth is not a rude word. | 2 |
| Only the minimum if that is the case. Growth is not a rude word. | 2 |
| word. | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | 4 |
| r | 1 |
| It should be minimal, but with an eve to future needs | |
| rather than current requirements | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | 2 |
| <u> </u> | 2 |

60% 40% 0% 0% 60%

40% 0% 0%

| DP9 comment | DP10 |
|--|------|
| | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | 1 |
| The best possible use should be made of the available technology. | 1 |
| Should be ahead of PBN not comply just due to legislations - leaders in field pre-empt next stage. Next 50+ years. | 1 |
| | 2 |
| Suggest optimum rather than maximum. | 1 |
| As long as appropriate backups exist to support the failure of these systems. | 1 |
| | |
| | 1 |
| Resilience was raised along with maintaining resilience. | 2 |

70% 30% 0% 0% 0% 30% 0% 0%

| DP10 comment | DP11 |
|---------------------------|----------|
| | 2 |
| | 2 |
| | i ' |
| Common sense | 1 |
| | 1 ' |
| | 1 ' |
| As above. | 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Stay ahead of legislation | <u> </u> |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | |
| | <u> </u> |
| | 1 |
| | 3 |
| | |
| | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | 1 |
| | 2 |

44% 44% 11% 0% 0% 44% 11% 0%

DP11 comment

We need a competitive element.

Need to maintain a good working relationship with neighbours.

Essential for future and operational requirements.

We should ensure that fair and equitable arrangements can be reached given that public perception is that Bristol is larger (or possibly more important)

| Additional/ | alternative | DPs |
|-------------|-------------|-----|
|-------------|-------------|-----|

Impact on ground??

Consideration for infrastructure improvements to support optimised airspace.

I would like to see Cardiff Airport using this to build their business case for expansion

| Comments on engagement process |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| Very efficient. |
| |
| |
| Very interesting and worthwhile meeting. |
| |
| |
| |
| Very informative, nice to be asked to engage. |
| Well conducted, enjoyably constructive. |
| |
| |
| More info about expected contribution would have been beneficial. |
| We did not receive the joining instructions or the issues to be |
| discussed. I would have been better served by the Aviators |
| workshop. |
| Being non-technical and having no expert knowledge of the aviation |
| industry it was challenging to delve into some specific aspects of the |
| DPs. However, I welcome more/further/future communication on |
| the ASCP. |







All data

| Question Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|-----|-----|-----|----|
| DPO Safety | 93% | 0% | 3% | 0% |
| DP1 Operational (Resilience) | 63% | 33% | 0% | 0% |
| DP2 Operational (Capacity) | 34% | 55% | 7% | 3% |
| DP3 Economic (Network Performance) | 41% | 37% | 15% | 7% |
| DP4 Environmental (CO2 emissions) | 59% | 21% | 10% | 7% |
| DP5 Environmental (Noise impact to stakeholders on the ground) | 34% | 34% | 24% | 7% |
| DP6 Technical (MoD Requirements) | 25% | 46% | 25% | 4% |
| DP7 Technical (General Aviation Impacts) | 34% | 45% | 21% | 0% |
| DP8 Technical (Minimise Controlled Air Space) | 41% | 33% | 22% | 4% |
| DP9 Technical (Use of PBN [Performance Based Navigation]) | 46% | 39% | 7% | 7% |
| DP10 Policy (PBN IR [Implementing Regulation]) | 52% | 38% | 7% | 3% |
| DP11 Technical (Impact on adjacent airfields/aerodromes) | 50% | 29% | 14% | 4% |

Aviation only

| Question Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|-----|-----|-----|---|
| DPO Safety | 95% | 0% | 0% | 1 |
| DP1 Operational (Resilience) | 53% | 41% | 0% | 1 |
| DP2 Operational (Capacity) | 42% | 47% | 5% | |
| DP3 Economic (Network Performance) | 22% | 44% | 22% | 1 |
| DP4 Environmental (CO2 emissions) | 37% | 32% | 16% | 1 |
| DP5 Environmental (Noise impact to stakeholders on the ground) | 16% | 47% | 26% | 1 |
| DP6 Technical (MoD Requirements) | 22% | 39% | 33% | |
| DP7 Technical (General Aviation Impacts) | 37% | 42% | 21% | 1 |
| DP8 Technical (Minimise Controlled Air Space) | 47% | 35% | 12% | |
| DP9 Technical (Use of PBN [Performance Based Navigation]) | 39% | 39% | 11% | 1 |
| DP10 Policy (PBN IR [Implementing Regulation]) | 42% | 42% | 11% | |
| DP11 Technical (Impact on adjacent airfields/aerodromes) | 53% | 21% | 16% | |

Community only

| Question Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|------|-----|-----|---|
| DP0 Safety | 90% | 0% | 10% | 1 |
| DP1 Operational (Resilience) | 80% | 20% | 0% | 1 |
| DP2 Operational (Capacity) | 20% | 70% | 10% | I |
| DP3 Economic (Network Performance) | 78% | 22% | 0% | I |
| DP4 Environmental (CO2 emissions) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 1 |
| DP5 Environmental (Noise impact to stakeholders on the ground) | 70% | 10% | 20% | I |
| DP6 Technical (MoD Requirements) | 30% | 60% | 10% | I |
| DP7 Technical (General Aviation Impacts) | 30% | 50% | 20% | I |
| DP8 Technical (Minimise Controlled Air Space) | 30% | 30% | 40% | 1 |
| DP9 Technical (Use of PBN [Performance Based Navigation]) | 60% | 40% | 0% | I |
| DP10 Policy (PBN IR [Implementing Regulation]) | 70% | 30% | 0% | 1 |
| DP11 Technical (Impact on adjacent airfields/aerodromes) | 44% | 44% | 11% | 1 |

5 3% 4% 0% 3% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%

4%

5

5% 6% 0% 5% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%

5%

5

0% 0%

0% 0%

0%

0%

0%

0% 0%

0%

0%