

# Meeting Minutes

---

<b>Project Title</b>	Biggin Hill 21 RNAV ACP (ACP-2019-86)
<b>Client</b>	Biggin Hill Airport (the Sponsor)
<b>Purpose of Meeting</b>	CAA ACP Assessment Meeting
<b>Date of Meeting</b>	14 <sup>th</sup> May 2020
<b>Held at</b>	Conference Call Meeting (due Covid 19)

**Present** Representing the Sponsor:

██████████ Operations Technical Support Manager, Biggin Hill  
██████████ Principal Consultant, Osprey CSL

Representing the CAA:

██████████ Airspace Regulator (Technical)  
██████████ Airspace Regulator (Senior Economist)  
██████████ Airspace Regulator (Environment)  
██████████ Principal Airspace Regulator  
██████████ Principal Airspace Regulator (IFP)  
██████████ Airspace Regulator (Consultation/Engagement)

<b>For Information</b>	██████████ CEO, Biggin Hill Airport
<b>Copies to</b>	Listed above
<b>Classification</b>	Unclassified
<b>Osprey Reference</b>	71372/002
<b>Issue</b>	Issue 1

This document is of UK origin and has been prepared by Osprey Consulting Services Limited (Osprey) and, subject to any existing rights of third parties, Osprey is the owner of the copyright therein. The document is furnished in confidence under existing laws, regulations and agreements covering the release of data. This document contains proprietary information of Osprey and the contents or any part thereof shall not be copied or disclosed to any third party without Osprey's prior written consent.

© Osprey Consulting Services Limited 2015



## Meeting Summary

Serial	Item	Action
1	<p><b>Opening introductions</b></p> <p>Participants were present as detailed above. The Agenda and Introductions were made together with confirmation that Minutes would be completed for submission to the CAA. (Slides 1-4)</p>	
1a	<p><b>CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement by CAA (MG)</b></p> <p>CAA noted that the Statement of Need (SoN) and Meeting Agenda 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• for the Sponsor to present and discuss their Statement of Need,</li> <li>• to enable the CAA to consider whether the proposal concerned falls within the scope of the formal airspace change process,</li> <li>• to enable the CAA to consider the appropriate provisional Level to assign to the change proposal.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>	
2	<p><b>Statement of Need (SoN) (discussion and review)</b></p> <p>The Sponsor's presentation (in its entirety) was delivered by ■■■, this included the SoN (Slide 5). It was stressed that the RNAV Procedure would replicate / mimic the existing Runway 21 ILS/DME/VOR procedure. It would act as a backup should the ILS fail and also provide an alternative method of navigation as the 'BIG' VOR is scheduled to be withdrawn from service.</p> <p>It was noted that an RNAV procedure for runway 21 had been submitted to the CAA in 2015, prior to the introduction of CAP1616, and had not been progressed by the CAA (due to higher priorities and CAA resources at that time).</p>	

Serial	Item	Action
3	<p><b>Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change</b></p> <p>(Slide 6) It was noted that the RNAV approach would compensate for any loss of the ILS. All airways traffic routing to Biggin Hill would be RNAV equipped. The RNAV approach allowed full integration with the UK Airspace Modernisation Strategy.</p>	
4	<p><b>Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified</b></p> <p>(Slides 7-12) The following items were highlighted by [REDACTED]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no change planned to aircraft types, numbers, emissions, noise, times of operation, heights flown, routings or airspace. Therefore, there would be no economic or environmental impact.</li> <li>• RNAV would improve access to the airspace as an alternative method of navigation, improve efficiency if the ILS were unavailable and improve operational capabilities.</li> <li>• The RNAV design would be PANS-OPS compliant (any deviation would have to be justified) and be submitted as a full IFP Design Package.</li> <li>• The Sponsor suggested that due to the ‘no change’ aspects of a ‘mirrored’ approach, the consultation could be through a reduced consultation period and address a targeted group of stakeholders/consultees where a specific interest in the procedure exists. This could be enhanced by the monthly Airport Consultative Committee being a route to engagement / consultation.</li> <li>• The level of ACP was discussed together with, due to the ‘mirrored’ aspects of the RNAV procedure, the potential to utilise a combined gateway at Stage 1 &amp; 2.</li> <li>• The scaling of the ACP was discussed and the Sponsor suggested the possibility of a Level 0 or Level 2C being allocated due to the ‘mirrored’ elements of the RNAV approach.</li> </ul>	
5	<p><b>Provisional indication of the scale level and CAA process requirements*</b></p> <p>It was agreed that an ACP was appropriate for a proposed RNAV approach to runway 21 at Biggin Hill with a provisional Level 1 being identified by the CAA [REDACTED] due to the possibility of an option altering lateral aircraft tracks or dispersion. However, it was stressed that this was ‘provisional’ and subject ‘To Being Confirmed’ at Stage 2b of the ACP process.</p> <p>The following observations were contributed by the CAA:</p> <p>[REDACTED] Noted that the aspiration was not to overfly any new communities. That the sponsor’s risk was to assure within their submission that the RNAV was ‘no change’ to the ILS procedure’s routing before the ACP can</p>	

Serial	Item	Action
	<p>progress to Stage 2 as a scaled ACP. That engagement was likely to be necessary to achieve the Design Principles.</p> <p>█ Noted the Sponsor should also consider the benefits of an RNAV approach procedure complying with FASI-South (LAMP 2) and the potential enhancements in reduced fuel burn (even though this is likely to be minimal).</p> <p>█ Advised that CAP1616 Para 121 outlines stakeholder groups expected to be engaged during early stages of the process, and the consultation strategy is to be used to present the rationale for stakeholders' selection for a consultation at Stage 3.</p> <p>█ Also acknowledged the sponsor's intention to pursue a reduced consultation period, and noted fundamental principles of effective consultation, as per Appendix C Para C31. █ explained that if a change sponsor believed that they could achieve these principles and conduct a consultation that was open, fair and transparent within a period of time that was less than the recognised 12-week standard, the justification/rationale for a reduced consultation must be provided at Stage 3, as part of the consultation strategy. The strategy will be assessed by the CAA at the CONSULT Gateway, and therefore acceptance of a reduced length of consultation will not be confirmed until this stage.</p> <p>█ Advised that proposal needs to be at a formative stage when going in to consultation, and the change sponsor has an 'open mind' throughout to ensure that the correct output is achieved.</p> <p>That the CAA and ACOG had developed additional guidance on engagement and consultation during the Covid-19 pandemic. This would be provided by the CAA (<i>Sec Note: this has been provided.</i>).</p> <p>█ Addressed Economic activities and noted that a Qualitative Assessment would be required as part of the Options Appraisal.</p> <p>█ Addressed Environmental activities and noted that the 'mimic' of the ILS by RNAV would require some environmental evidence in the form of a qualitative assessment, possibly supported by other information as a 'suite' of evidence.</p> <p>Also, noted CAP1616 Appendix B and the tranquillity elements addressed therein.</p> <p>█ Addressed IFP activities and highly recommended engagement with the sponsor's IFP designer to evidence the 'mirrored' approach.</p> <p>(General Note): Any scaling of the process, such as a shorter Consultation period will require justification. The CAA highlighted that one of the risks associated with submitting for a multi-gateway is that if the ACP did not pass the first Gateway, then it would not be approved to progress and the whole submission would need to be re-submitted.</p>	

Serial	Item	Action
	<p><i>* When the sponsor submits their gateway materials for each Gateway at the agreed submission deadline, the period between this and the gateway decision will be an analysis by the CAA Airspace Regulatory team (Airspace Regulation) of the documentation submitted, for the purposes of making a recommendation to the CAA Gateway decision maker(s). In conducting the gateway assessment, the CAA is assessing the process employed and its compliance with the guidance stipulated within CAP1616. It is not an assessment of the merits of the submission itself, which is reviewed at Stage 5 - Decision. We may request, documentation from the sponsor that is referred to in the gateway submission but has not been provided as part of the Gateway submission materials. We may also request the sponsor to provide information by way of clarification relating to statements or assumptions made in the submission. Any further information sought by Airspace Regulation at this stage is for clarificatory purposes and is only for determining compliance with the CAP 1616 process.</i></p> <p><i>In any instance where a sponsor has not met the requirements of the process, the CAA will inform them after the gateway decision and advise of next steps.</i></p>	
6	<p><b>Provisional process timescales*</b></p> <p>A discussion concerning provisional gateway timescales followed and these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define: 25 Sep 20</li> <li>• Develop &amp; Assess: 27 Nov 20</li> <li>• Consult: 26 Feb 21</li> <li>• Submit to CAA: 2 Jul 21</li> <li>• Decide: 29 Oct 21</li> <li>• Implement: AIRAC 02/2022</li> </ul> <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> <p><i>1. The SoS has directed that the CAA prioritise GNSS applications which may have an impact on the progression of the Biggin Hill ACP if the CAA needs to direct resource accordingly</i></p> <p><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>	
7	<p><b>Next steps</b></p> <p>The following points were noted:</p> <p>██████ The RNAV procedure was submitted in 2015 and no consultation was necessary at that time. The sponsor has tried to progress this with the CAA, but no progress has been forthcoming. Therefore, any shortening of the ACP</p>	

Serial	Item	Action
	<p>process would be appreciated. It was also accepted that the CAA had not had the resource at that time, to progress the request.</p> <p>█ It was noted that the minutes must be prepared in accordance with CAP1616 and that a provisional timeline would be required for CAA approval. The CAA would expect document submissions, for each stage of the process, 4 weeks prior to the planned Gateway date.</p>	█
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Any other business</b></p> <p>█ Noted that engagement records/evidence must be maintained as these will be used to assess the validity of engagement activity. █ also referred the change sponsor to CAP 1616 Appendix D, Para D8 that lists expected outputs for Stage 1B.</p> <p>█ Noted that if the sponsor believed that this was a scalable ACP then it would require to be evidenced by the sponsor.</p>	

### Summary of Actions

Action	Description	Status	Owner(s)	Due Date
1.1	Prepare minutes	Closed	Osprey	20/5/20
7.1	Prepare provisional timeline	Closed	█	26/5/20

█  
Operations Technical Support Manager, Biggin Hill Airport  
**ACP Sponsor**