

**MINUTES OF RAF LITTLE RISSINGTON FORMAL AIRSPACE STRUCTURE (ACP-2019-45)
ASSESSMENT MEETING HELD VIA SKYPE ON 27 APR 20**

27 Apr 20

CAA
DAATM
2 FTS

Present	Appointment	Representing
	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA (Chair)
	Airspace Specialist (Environmental)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	Principal Airspace Regulator	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Engage/Cons)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Snr Economist)	CAA
	2 FTS Air Safety Manager	MOD
	SO2 Airspace DAATM	MOD
	Aerodrome Operator	MOD (Sponsor/Sec)

CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

CAA noted that the following agenda and presentation were 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
Item 1 – Introduction	
All present introduced themselves and their role; no apologies were received	N/A

<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</p> <p>The sponsor highlighted the Statement of Need, as per the presentation, and expanded on the location of RAF Little Rissington (LR) and number of Safety Incidents that led to this proposal. The sponsor also explained the “business” of 2 FTS in that it was responsible for providing gliding opportunities (which included training to solo standard) for RAF Air Cadets.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change</p> <p>The sponsor highlighted the opportunities from this proposed change, which included reduction of safety incidents, improved positive two-way communication, provision of airfield and traffic information to increase situational awareness, in order to reduce the likelihood of loss of safe separation. The sponsor also highlighted that there would be no increase in activity or airfield movements as a result of this proposal. Since 2 FTS operates conventional gliders, which have no engine and therefore silent, there will be no noise or environmental impacts.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Item 4 – Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified</p> <p>The sponsor highlighted the opportunities within this proposal, which included the exploitation of the airfield VHF (120.775MHz) and Mil Air Ground Communication Service (AGCS) to enhance positive two-way communication and access to airspace (Rule 11). Targeted timings only to cover 2 FTS activity, ie daylight hours and at weekends/Public Holidays; other time by NOTAM. Consultation with key stakeholders, local airfields and integration with other ACPs will be required.</p> <p>■ asked whether the activation by NOTAM would be exploited by other Mil units that use LR and external to 2 FTS. ■ explained that Parachute Training School (PTS) raise their own NOTAMs for their activity through AR Ops (due to the fact they often parachute from 15000ft) and Joint Helicopter Command (JHC) are very brief visits. ■ also explained the activation by NOTAM was to cover 2 FTS activities that take place during the working week and would be approximately 4-5 weeks per year (usually around school holidays).</p> <p>■ asked whether the Mil AGCS was similar to the Civil version. ■ explained it was based on the Civil version and it was developed in consultation with both the CAA and MAA. It follows CAP 452 and CAP 413, but has more oversight and assurance processes, ie there are currency and standardisation requirements.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Item 5 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements</p> <p>The Sponsor sought clarification that this proposal would be considered iaw CAA SARG ATZ Policy Statement.</p> <p>■ stated that since this proposal was the formalisation of airfield and activity already in place (ie an established gliding site that has been at LR for many years), then the ATZ Policy was appropriate.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>Item 6 – Provisional process timescales*</p> <p>The sponsor highlighted the following assumptions: potential to process as a Level 2C change; ATZ establishments do not require a Stage 2 options development; Stage 3 engagement 12 weeks; Stage 4 update and submission work 6 weeks; submission for Stage 5 assessment could be from 31 Aug 20 onwards, subject to ACP progression to Stage 3.</p> <p>■ highlighted that whilst a Stage 2 options development was not required, the sponsor should still provide evidence of other options that were considered, and how the proposal arrived at ATZ as the solution.</p> <p>■ referenced CAP 1616 requirements in terms of the groups of stakeholders with which engagement is expected and encouraged the use of stakeholder identification methodologies to establish a full list of individual stakeholders within each group.</p> <p>■ stated that a qualitative assessment and options appraisal would be required as part of Stage 2. ■ stated that as this was a Military request it was not certain if this assessment and appraisal would be required, but the CAA would discuss internally and would provide further guidance to the sponsor.</p> <p>The CAA also highlighted that the environmental impact potentially caused by other (civil) aircraft and users, ie will aircraft need to route around the ATZ or contact the AGCS, would need to be detailed in the submission.</p> <p><i>* The provisional timeline put forward at this assessment meeting will be subject to change by the CAA. This will currently mainly be for two reasons;</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The SoS has directed us to prioritise GNSS applications which may have an impact on your ACP if we need to direct resource accordingly</i> <i>2. The FASI(S) masterplan requires proposals within that plan to be progressed in a coordinated way, in accordance with a programme plan. Once this masterplan has been accepted by us, it may require us to rearrange Gateway bookings to achieve coordination which may include changing a gateway slot that you have previously been targeting.</i> 	<p>■</p>
<p>Item 7 – Next steps</p> <p>The sponsor would need to publish the approved minutes and presentation on the ACP portal before moving to Stage 2.</p> <p>Appendix B to CAP 1616 contains the environmental assessment requirements. CAP 1616 also details groups of stakeholders for consultation, how to identify other key stakeholders and key tests that must be met for submission.</p> <p>■ highlighted that due to COVID-19 restrictions, it was more difficult to consult, ie Regional Airspace User Working Groups (RAUWG) and asked if there was any alternative methods or considerations to this stage. ■ stated that the CAA had produced some additional guidance for airspace change sponsors and agreed to share this outside of the meeting, along with further clarity on the Stage 3 process requirements.</p>	<p>■</p> <p>■</p>

<p>Item 8 – Any other business</p> <p>The CAA highlighted that the submission should include correspondence with RAF Brize Norton (BZN) and the RAUWG.</p> <p>■ highlighted that the BZN proposed ACP would strengthen the LR ACP; however, the CAA stated that the LR ACP needs to be independent of both the BZN and Oxford ACPs and that no assumptions should be made with respect to the outcome of the Decision phase for these ACPs.</p>	
--	--

**ACTIONS ARISING FROM RAF LITTLE RISSINGTON FORMAL AIRSPACE STRUCTURE
(ACP-2019-45) ASSESSMENT MEETING**

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Item 6	■	Qualitative assessment and options appraisal requirement to be confirmed	8 May 20
Item 7	■	ACP presentation and minutes of assessment meeting would need to be uploaded to the ACP portal	15 May 20
Item 7	■	Consultation requirements during COVID-19 restrictions to be clarified.	8 May 20

Wing Commander ■
Aerodrome Operator
RAF Little Rissington
ACP Sponsor