

Ser	Question	Question and Description	Answer (Y/N)	Remarks	Attached detail	Reviewer Remarks	Kemble Response 31 Oct 19	CAA Response 7 Nov 18	CAA Remarks/Comments
1	CAP1122	<p>How many traffic movements do you expect on an average day</p> <p><i>This question is to gain an understanding of how busy the aerodrome is and consequently the possibility of conflict with aircraft conducting the procedure.</i></p> <p><i>Describe what you consider to be an average day. (Supported by data)</i></p> <p><i>How have you come to the answer?</i></p> <p><i>We would like to understand, how have you satisfied yourself that the number of movements is acceptable.</i></p> <p><i>How will you manage the rate of change as your business develops? . i.e. more pilots using the procedure (See later questions)</i></p>		<p>All data used to answer this question has been extracted directly from the Airport's RedAtlas management system. The attachments are the raw extractions. Based on 2018 annual figures, the airport averages 88 movements per day (annually). In the summer period, this can rise to an average (throughout the summer period) of 115 movements per day (averaging 14 per hour). However, peak periods, usually a few days of good weather within a longer period of non VMC, shows averages of 156 movements per day. Against the 2018 totals of 31,753 annual movements, 94.7% of these movements were GA (rotary and fixed wing). The remaining 5.3% are a mix of commercial helicopters(4%), corporate jets(1.2%) and Cat D airliners (B777 to A320) making up the remaining 0.1%. Only Corporate Jets and Cat D airliners are in scope for the GPS Approach, with potential use by some commercial helicopters, subject to operational capacity. Using annual averages, the number of movements which are in-scope for the approach is 1 aircraft per day (2 movements); monthly peaks and troughs (using 2018 data) suggest a low of 0 and a high of 3 movements of future participating aircraft.</p> <p>Currently, the visual circuit is cleared to allow for corporate jet and Cat D arrivals and departures. Additionally, for royal flights, RAF Brize Norton overlays CAS(T) airspace over Kemble which sanitises the ATZ. Kemble also retains its rule 5 (SERA 5055) exemption for display practices; Operationally, the ATZ has been successfully sanitised for display practices, without incident. In summary, Kemble has successfully</p>	<p>Movement summary data extracted from RedAtlas</p>	Accepted	NFA		
2	CAP1122.11	<p>Is your aerodrome currently licenced</p> <p><i>Flights which must use licensed or Government aerodrome 208.— (1) Subject to paragraph (6), article 207 applies to any aeroplane which has a maximum take-off mass of more than 5,700kg flying on a flight—</i></p> <p><i>(a)for the purpose of the commercial air transport of passengers or the public transport of passengers;</i></p> <p><i>(b)for the purpose of instruction in flying given to any person for the purpose of becoming qualified for the grant of a pilot's licence or the inclusion of an aircraft rating, a night rating or a night qualification in a licence; or</i></p> <p><i>(c)for the purpose of carrying out flying examinations for the grant of a pilot's licence or the inclusion of an aircraft rating or a night rating in a licence.</i></p> <p><i>(2) Subject to paragraph (6), article 207 applies to any aeroplane which has a maximum take-off mass of not more than 5,700kg flying on a flight which is—</i></p> <p><i>(a)a scheduled journey for the purpose of the commercial air transport of passengers or the public transport of passengers;</i></p> <p><i>(b)for the purpose of the commercial air transport of passengers or the public transport of passengers and which begins and ends at the same aerodrome; or</i></p> <p><i>(c)for the purpose of the commercial air transport of passengers or the public transport of passengers and which is at night.</i></p> <p><i>(3) Subject to paragraph (6), article 207 applies to any helicopter or gyroplane flying on a flight which is a scheduled journey for the purpose of the public transport of passengers.</i></p> <p><i>(4) Subject to paragraph (6), article 207 applies to any helicopter or gyroplane of which the maximum take-off mass is more than 3,175kg flying on a flight—</i></p>		<p>CAA Ordinary Licence No P863</p>	<p>Aerodrome Licence</p>	Accepted	NFA		
3	CAP1122.01	<p>Will you employ PPR procedures?</p> <p><i>Prior Permission Required</i></p> <p><i>Do you require users of the aerodrome to gain prior permission to use the aerodrome facilities?</i></p> <p><i>How do you use PPR now including based aircraft and Visitors.</i></p> <p><i>How do you intend to use PPR in the future.</i></p> <p><i>For example, what will you do if aircraft are late?</i></p> <p><i>Have you previous experience of using PPR?</i></p> <p><i>Are the users of your airfield used to applying PPR at this airfield?</i></p>	<p>Yes (How will this work?) (what will you do when it fails) refer to items in description</p>	<p>Kemble currently operates a PPR only process. Do you require users of the aerodrome to gain prior permission to use the aerodrome facilities? Yes, see UK AIP EGBP AD 2.3 Operational Hours 12 Remarks. KAOP 020 refers. This is re-enforced during events or period of high activity through PPR time slots for arrivals and departures. How do you use PPR now including based aircraft and Visitors. All requests have to be made either by phone 01285 771177 or email ops@cotswoldairport.com How do you intend to use PPR in the future. No change. Pilot notes will include a specific that filing an FPL doesn't constitute PPR There will also be a cross reference to the IAP slot allocation system for operators intending to use the instrument approach procedures. For example, what will you do if aircraft are late? Normal day to day operations do not require timed slots for PPR. If an inbound a/c is late and concerns are raised then overdue a/c procedures are started see KAOP 035 and Air Traffic Services & FISO Manual V.9 1/5/19 Appendix A Aircraft Emergency Procedures A2, A3 A4 and A6 If an a/c in possession of PPR and an allocated IAP slot time is late the AFISO will liaise with the senior duty manager (AOM or Airport Director) for a tactical decision. Have you previous experience of using PPR? Yes as audited and approved. Are the users of your airfield used to applying PPR at this airfield? Yes. It is normal practice across the UK. We have no evidence of abuse of the system.</p>	<p>KAOP 20, KAOP 35</p>	<p>Please provide additional information regarding the process for a tactical decision based on late aircraft</p>	<p>Currently, an arriving flights progress is monitored via FlightRadar24 or Radar360 for situational awareness and a slot can easily be altered to suit an inbound aircraft arrival. Tactical decisions can then be made to clear the ATZ at the appropriate time. Traffic flow inbound is also subject to other agencies that liaise with Kemble AFISO, such as sector 23 and RAF Brize Norton to update Kemble to allow preparations for arrival. In a use case scenario for the active IAP. An inbound jet will PPR an arrival slot (maximum 5 slots per day). Each slot is separated by 1.5 hrs. In this scenario, the jet has PPR'd onto slot 2 (1100). The jet has an early arrival buffer of 1045, and allocated slot start of 1100, a slot complete time of 1130 and an overrun buffer to 1145. As a PPR Airport, we would not accept PPR bookings for this slot period, which just then leaves the based GA traffic to be tactically managed for arrival and departure. Arriving from the national airways system, the SRD states MALBY for Kemble arrivals (although Sector 23 has been known to drop them out at SIREN). Both are also (2 of 6) RAF Brize NORTON SRD entries for their STARS. Within the bounds of the current LOA, on pre-notification (via AFPEX) Kemble inbound from the airways is provided with a LARS service (within irreducible capacity) to deconflict with any RAF Brize Norton or Fairford active STARS or SIDs. Positioning advice will be given to the IAF.</p> <p>If the jet is in receipt of a radar service from RAF Brize Norton, Brize will confirm the aircraft is at the IAF by telephone to Kemble VCR, before releasing the jet to Kemble. If the aircraft is VFR and not in receipt of a radar service, the proposed AIP entry will require the PIC to confirm he is ready to commence the IAP and time on the IAF. This will then set a time for the IAP to be flown and thus allow any tactical management of based traffic. Any traffic yet to depart Kemble, will be held on the ground (under the positive control privileges of a FISO). Traffic information will be provided to all PPR approaching traffic and that holding on the ground.</p> <p>If the jet cannot continue to approach, through defined operating minima for the IAP (RVR and 500ft DH), or the runway is blocked, the jet may have to execute a go-around or missed approach. Our missed approach procedure is anticipated to work for the IAP as it does now. The jet would climb out, we would pre-notify this to RAF Brize Norton on the dedicated phone line in Kemble's VCR, which rings at all controller stations at RAF Brize Norton. We anticipate the IAP design will incorporate a closed loop transition back to the IAF. We would request the jet reports leaving the ATZ and suggest the changes frequency back to Brize. Once the jet is confirmed clear of the ATZ, the PPR aircraft and those outside the ATZ or waiting on the ground can then be tactically managed. It is unlikely that the aircraft will be able to remain within its current IAP slot; if the visibility or cloud base is below the IAP minima, it is unlikely to change quickly enough, and the aircraft would be advised to divert to its alternative airport. Obstacles on the runway or within the transitional area are likely to deliver the same outcome.</p> <p>Once the aircraft has landed, the IAP slot allocation would be wound up as the aircraft lands and this confirmed with RAF Brize Norton, via the telephone link which rings on all controller desks within RAF Brize Norton's radar room.</p> <p>In terms of integrating departing IFR traffic, Kemble will pre notify RAF Brize Norton on the dedicated phone line. At present, Brize will provide an IFR release from Kemble, with a Squawk. The Brize Release allows Brize to manage any conflicting traffic with the Kemble departing IFR traffic. This currently works very well; the dedicated line and the casual employment of 3 x RAF Brize Norton Radar Controllers in Kemble's VCR, ensures mutual understanding and open communications.</p>		
4	CAP1122.01.01	<p>Are you limiting access to this proposed instrument procedure?</p> <p><i>Are you intending to cap the number of aircraft flying this proposed instrument procedure?</i></p> <p><i>How many per month, day, year etc?</i></p> <p><i>How will you manage this limitation of access?</i></p>		<p>Are you intending to cap the number of aircraft flying this proposed instrument procedure? Yes, there will be a restricted number of slots available each day - see attached document. How many per month, day, year etc? There will not be a movements limit based on totals per. The only limitation will be the physical number of slots available during operational hours. However, as articulated elsewhere the objective is to provide defined approaches for certain types of a/c which represent a very small percentage of the total annual movements. How will you manage this limitation of access? Through a combination of the mandatory PPR process and regular liaison with stakeholder operators. Training and other GA recreational flights are not permitted to use the IAPs.</p>	<p>IAP PPR Proposed Slots Matrix</p>	<p>How are aircraft departing IFR integrated into the PPR slot system</p>	<p>Building upon the last answer for integrating departing IFR traffic into the PPR System: Kemble currently pre notify RAF Brize Norton on the dedicated phone line. At present, Brize will provide a Flight Planned IFR release from Kemble, with a Squawk. The Brize Release allows Brize to manage any conflicting traffic with the Kemble departing IFR traffic, since in IMC all localised traffic will be in receipt of at least a Basic Service from Brize LARS; there is no other LARS available, less London FIR. This allows a coordinated tactical management of the aircraft departure. This currently works very well; the dedicated line and the casual employment of 3 x RAF Brize Norton Radar Controllers in Kemble's VCR, ensures mutual understanding and open communications. This casual employment is an historic relationship of mutual benefit. As per the previous question, we will request the PIC reports leaving the ATZ, allowing for a known IMC environment in the ATZ for subsequent IFR traffic in and out of Kemble The ACP does not propose a SID and is a RNAV for arrivals only. Therefore, this departure process will remain extant.</p>		
5	CAP1122.01.02	<p>Do you manage ground movements on the aerodrome?</p> <p><i>This question is looking to determine how you might minimise the risk of runway incursions by vehicles or other aircraft</i></p>		<p>Kemble is a FISO airfield. All ground movement are controlled in accordance with the AFISO/ATS Manual. This includes all aircraft and vehicles from the airport authority and those maintenance vehicles from Air Salvage International (based P145 Maintenance organisation). Each holding point CAP168 compliant has signage and markings. Vehicle access across the 08 threshold hold is limited, firstly by card access through airside electronic gates and secondly via clearly signage, road markings and finally crossing lights controlled from the tower.</p> <p>KAOPS and manuals have been checked through either ANSP or Aerodrome Audits. A number of KAOPS (Kemble SOPs) detail Aerodrome Inspections (KAOP 1), Works of the Movement Areas (KAOP 17), Airside Driving Manual (KAOP 19), Permits to Work Procedures (airside and Non-Airside) (KAOP 70). Any runway incursion incidents are raised through Kemble Incident reports (KIRS) or MOR (if appropriate) and the</p>	<p>KAOP 001, 017, 019, 070.</p>	Accepted	NFA		

6	CAP1122.01.03	Do you have the ability to check the runway is free from obstructions? <i>This question is looking to establish if you have the ability and facilities to check the runway for obstructions before someone uses the proposed instrument approach.</i>	The aerodrome (all operational areas) and lighting is checked twice daily in accordance with KAOP 010 Aerodrome Inspection Procedure. For in-scope aircraft for the proposed approach (Cat D airliner arrivals and over 6 tonne MTOW corporate jets), the runway is additionally checked for FOD (and wildlife control, as appropriate) prior to the aircraft's arrival into the ATZ. See KAOP 024 Airliner Arrival (end of life) and KAOP 061 Safeguarding for Aircraft over 5700kg.	KAOP 001, 010, 024, 061	Accepted	NFA			
7	Complex.01.03.01	Do you have the ability to inform approaching aircraft if the runway is obstructed?	Depending on where an approaching a/c is should the runway becomes obstructed determines the means by which information is transmitted. Options available to the AFISO include: NOTAM Telephone to Swannick Sectors Telephone to RAF Brize Norton ATC VHF R/T on 118.430 or Signal Lamp from the VCR	KAOP 23 - Aerodrome Closure KAOP 035 Aerodrome Emergency Orders	Accepted	NFA			
8	CAP1122.01.04	Do you have the ability to limit the use of the aerodrome and by association, the ATZ and the procedure? <i>This question is trying to establish how you might practically limit the number of pilots using the proposed instrument procedure.</i>	As previously stated there is a mandatory PPR system in place including a severely restricted slot allocation system. Only one a/c will be permitted to use the IAP at any time and the buffer zones each side will help ensure this limit is adhered to. Furthermore, because of the small number of applicable a/c forecast to make use of the procedure, coupled with the flight information systems already in use providing the AFISO with real time situational awareness, a robust system achieves the limits.	KAOP 23 - Aerodrome Closure KAOP 020 - PPR Procedures Proposed IAP Slots KAOP 035 Aerodrome Emergency Orders	Please provide detail on how use of the ATZ will be limited	As highlighted in the use case to answer the previous questions (3 & 4), in VMC, PPR and slots times will allow a time restriction on inbound traffic. Outbound traffic can be held on the ground (AFISO has positive control on the ground). Both allow time gaps to be created between PPR expected arrivals, departures and inbound RNAV approach traffic on the slot system. The IAP is limited to 5 slots per day and PPR only. The design of the PPR slots, takes account of a safety margin for early and late arrivals at the IAF. For the total period of the PPR IAP slot, no GA PPR arrivals will be accepted. Kemble's AIP published we are PPR only and non-radio traffic is not accepted. Additionally, any PPR aircraft arriving earlier or later, within the IAP slot period will be provided with Traffic information when calling to enter the ATZ or prior for airfield information and joining instructions. Flight information would be provided (as it is now) to advise the PIC of a jet on the IAP and expected arrival time (based on the reported IAF time). In IMC, we anticipate that the IAP cloud base minima (500ft) to lower than our current GA/Microlight 1000ft circuit height, therefore in weather conditions from VMC Minima to IMC, the weather will provide a limitation for the use of the ATZ. In IMC, all transiting aircraft will be in receipt of a service from RAF Brize Norton, as the only LARS service in the area. To allow for jet wake turbulence separation ICAO, (https://www.skybrary.aero/index.php/Mitigation_of_Wake_Turbulence_Hazard#Minimum_Distance_Separation) specifies 6 NM for a Heavy aircraft and 5 NM for a Medium aircraft for light/GA landing after the IAP traffic. Using 6 NM as the minimum distance, this equates to 4 mins at 90kts IAS. In practical terms, the Kemble circuit takes a minimum of 6 mins to complete, placing aircraft crosswind with 4 mins remaining to touchdown, would deliver the wake turbulence hazard separation. We anticipate further safety case development to specify how this is managed practically in the ATZ Manual and ATZ safety case. For current jet arrivals (and with close liaison with other agencies, such as RAF Brize Norton or Sector 23), Kemble FISOs currently provides traffic information to transiting traffic and those arriving earlier or later than their booked PPR time have been advised to remain outside the ATZ whilst a jet is arriving. We anticipate the design of the approach and planned slot times will provide a time buffer for early and late IAP traffic and provide a no PPR period for GA traffic planning to arrive at Kemble. Using 2018 figures of 381 corporate Jet (Cat A to B) and 26 Cat C or D arrivals, no Kemble incident reports, MORs or AIRPROX have been raised for the past 10 years between a light aircraft and an arriving Airliner/Corporate jet. This is without the additional safety mitigations of a defined approach, fan line on aeronautical charts and specific AIP entries. I am aware of the incident AAIB Report 08/2010 between a commercial twin on an approach and a light aircraft on final; we anticipate that the above mitigation measures we plan to implement, address the issues identified in the AAIB report. Subject to further safety assessment within the CAP 1616 safety case, I am content this risk will be ALARP, particularly when based on the data of no reported incidents, our operating procedures and number of current Cat A to D jet arrivals (and departures), including Royal Flights (under CAS(T)).			KAOP 23 will require amendments to ensure mitigations can be effectively implemented, including consideration for traffic which cannot be managed in this way, e.g ATZ transits
9	CAP1122.02	Will this approach only be conducted after approval/contact with the aerodrome?	See previous answers. PPR, slot allocation, FIDS, VHF r/t.		Accepted	NFA			
10	CAP1122.03	Do you have the ability to integrate Visual and Instrument traffic?	No, but in this case the system will specifically separate the two. This will be achieved by the IAP slot arrival allocation system coupled with the airport authority closing the airport and circuit to all other movements at the time. This is already a tried and tested system employed for the movement of Royal Persons in a/c of the Queen's Flight and other specifically chartered jets.		Answer (Yes) AFISO integration is limited to passing of traffic information. Please provide further details and a reference to the procedure currently in place to close the airport and circuit.	There is no "requirement" to provide separation between VFR and IFR traffic in class G airspace. It is correct to state that a FISO cannot enter into agreements, however the acceptance of agreements by pilots are not mandatory and CAP 774 para 1.7 warns of the limitations of such agreements. Aircraft remaining clear of the ATZ whilst during an IAP will be operating in class G airspace and in receipt of a basic service. To reduce the risk of a mid-air collision they will have been advised of both the instrument traffic and of other known traffic operating in the vicinity and will however, in accordance with the rules applicable to class G airspace, remain responsible for their own traffic and terrain collision avoidance. However, I am aware of the AAIB report for the MAC incident at Coventry between a twin and light aircraft. Accounting for this, our PPR system articulated in Q8, Kemble will develop a timed separation between PPR IAP slots (IFR Traffic) and PPR inbound aircraft (VFR Traffic), with outbound being either held of the ground or tactically managed for departure. We anticipate further safety case development when the IAP designs are finalised during Stage 4 of the ACP to establish the most pragmatic and ALARP time/position the aircraft is when flying the IAP to managing aircraft out of the circuit. Current proactive works the same way, albeit it without a defined approach so timed/positional management/traffic information provision is more difficult to deliver and generally only known when the PIC reports visual and on final. Despite this, both RAF Brize Norton and Kemble are not aware of any incidents or reported AIRPROX between an aircraft (up to and including B747/A340) on a long final and any GA traffic, which suggests that despite the limitation of an AFISO traffic information, the risk remains ALARP. Analysis of CAA published AIRPROX data also shows no AIRPROX (since 2000) on the extended centreline for Kemble and in the area of both proposed ACP RNAV options. Outside of the ATZ is a Class G environment: pilots are given clear guidance surrounding IAPs in class G airspace and remain responsible for their own collision avoidance CAP1535 page 70 & 72 refer. Whilst not able to enter into agreements, AFISOs are able to issue warnings to traffic when it is considered that a definite risk of collision exists. CAP 797 para 8.17 refers. We will ensure that all AFISOs are reminded of the guidance provided in CAP 797 to ensure compliance with national standards. Additionally, IAP "feathers" will be promulgated on aeronautical charts. VFR traffic will be requested to remain clear of the IAP area on our AIP.		Answer 'Yes' AFISO integration is limited to passing traffic information. Please provide further details and a reference to the procedure currently in place to close the airport and circuit.	
11	CAP1122.04	Do you have any data on traffic levels and their patterns outside your ATZ? <i>How have you assured yourself that this is a safe procedure? If you have an estimate how have you gained this information?</i>	No, nor are we statutorily required so to do. It is Class G airspace and the CAA requires no aerodrome with only an ATZ to gather such data. However, a number of measures which will militate against the MAC risk alluded to in the question are already covered elsewhere. Existing CAA published Airprox data provides some idea, which is very low in this area.		Insufficient data to allow effective assessment	Additionally, we have identified several activities at the start of this process and engaged with key stakeholders. In terms of GA, these have included the Gliding Communities, in particular BGGC at Nympsfield advised as c10k movements per annum and Cotswold Gliding Club at Aston Down, who advised c20k movements per annum, resulting in a new Letter of Agreement with Aston Down which is c3.5Nm NW of Kemble. This includes a Saipplane Accessible Area (SAA) in the underused NW quadrant of Kemble's ATZ to both assist in National Gliding Competitions and more importantly place all associated glider traffic away into a known area and from our extended centreline to RW08. Oaksey Park (GA grass unlicensed airfield) is to the SE of Kemble, who advised c15k movements per year. Due to the proximity of both Aston Down and Oaksey Park, we have open lines of communication. There are small grass strips within a 10Nm radius from Kemble, most with less than a handful of based aircraft. Additionally, most based GA aircraft route south from Kemble to a training area south of Lyneham. We are proactively trying to eradicate an unhelpful chart symbology associated with South Cerney and its former use for parachuting which creates the false impression of a 1.2 Nm wide choke point, funneling GA traffic between Kemble's ATZ and South Cerney. Both Kemble and Brize have raised this to DATM. This is of particular concern, since following approval, the AIRAC publication of the IAP will deliver feathered arrows on the chart. This is 7Nm aligned from each runway; for RW26 this is through the inactive, yet marked South Cerney paratropping site. Beyond GA, the attached chart, graphically represents the STARS and SIDs for both RAF Brize Norton and the STAR 7.3 (2D) and SID BADMIN 1X and WOTAN 1Z for Bristol. Analysis of the latter and discussion (as part of the ACP engagement, with minutes on the ACP site) with Bristol suggest STAR 7.3 is south of any Kemble SRD route and both relevant SIDs are above FL60 to join the airways at BADMIN and WOTAN above Kemble's extended centreline. The current proposed IAP has a IAF altitude of 2500ft QNH, underneath the WOTAN airways join. Subject to IAP design option (Pans Ops Doc 8168), both Bristol SIDs therefore have at least 2500ft vertical separation above any Kemble RW08 IAF traffic. For RAF Brize Norton's STARS and SIDs, their SRD has STARS from MALBY, SIREN (Along with MIMBI, HON, DTY and BCN). The current SRD for Kemble's traffic to and from airways is MALBY. The remaining STARS routes to Brize Norton are clear of Kemble IMC airways traffic. The only potentially conflicting SID is to MALBY for both RW09 and RW27. However, law our current LOA with RAF Brize Norton, Brize Radar provides a LARS service from Kemble's SRD route to de-conflict with their own traffic and to position for an approach to Kemble; Sector 23 will deconflict any traffic departing the airways at MALBY, law with SRD. We anticipate amending the LOA with RAF Brize Norton, with finalised proposed IAP designs during Stage 4 of the ACP to be more specific in the transition from SRD to IAF on the approach, for both RW08 and RW26. This may necessitate a SRD change of SRD to better provide the transition, law DOC 8168. Any non-airways traffic IFR traffic inbound to Kemble has a LARS service from RAF Brize Norton (within capacity) and may include an approach radar service through Brize Zone, if requested by the PIC. Current low-level Cat A and B, such as a PC12, arrives into Kemble VFR. The current proposed IAF for RW26 is set at 2500ft QNH. RAF Fairford's MATZ is opened and closed by NOTAM under control of RAF Brize Norton. Brize, controls all Fairford's traffic and by virtue of the LOA with Brize Norton, this also accounts for RAF Fairford Traffic. There is no UK NATS published plates for Fairford's RW09 and RW27 ILS. However, discussion with their ATC Manager (and RAF Brize Norton) suggest the follow, which we anticipate will be included in the updated LOA with RAF Brize Norton: 1. All Fairford (non ATZ) traffic is managed by RAF Brize Norton and falls within our current LOA with Brize Norton. 2. Similar E/W runway alignment between Kemble, Fairford and Brize allows for distance/altitude separation (assuming a 3-degree glide slope ICAO Doc 8168 Pans Ops). In terms of risk mitigation, analysis of only available data (AIRPROX) shows no conflicts reported around the Kemble ATZ with approaching jet traffic. Our current levels of jet traffic arrivals, no reported AIRPROX incidents, since 2000. This suggests assurance of a safe procedure currently, which will be safer with a defined, published and chart annotated approach.			
12	CAP1122.05	Are there any aviation activities outside your ATZ that could interact with this procedure? <i>We are looking to understand that you have knowledge of other procedures and routes that might interfere with the procedure including the missed approach. (i.e. choke points, corridors, danger areas etc) Demonstrate that you have an understanding of traffic outside your ATZ.</i>	Yes, we have identified a number of activities at the start of this process and engaged with key stakeholders. These have included the Gliding Communities, in particular BGGC at Nympsfield and Cotswold Gliding Club at Aston Down, resulting in new Letters of Agreement being developed. Also military operations associated with RAF Brize Norton and Fairford which are well known and already successfully managed have again resulted in a new LoA. We are proactively trying to eradicate unhelpful chart symbology associated with South Cerney and its former use for parachuting which creates the false impression of a choke point. We are aware of all the other small GA sites in the vicinity such as Oaksey Park and have lines of communication open. Lastlv, with RAF Brize Norton a comms plan to encourage wider use of the LARS will		Answer is inconsistent with 1122.04. (Q11) additional information required.	Yes, answered in the previous question.			
13	CAP1122.05.01	Have there been any reported incidents in the last year with straight in approach aircraft being interfered with by transiting traffic? <i>What we are trying to establish here is the likely level of interaction between traffic using the proposed procedure and other non-participants. Reported incidents might provide useful data to support any application.</i>	None reported. There is a two level visual circuit which is rigidly enforced for light a/c and microlights/rotary wing. It requires a/c to turn from down wind so that the final approach is flown well with the ATZ and in any case not over Kemble and Caulkerton villages. The only a/c making straight in approaches are general jets arriving off a radar vectored approach to a stabilised visual approach.		In there any supporting evidence available regarding interaction between aircraft during the current radar vectored approach phase?	No reported data, since no reported incidents. Three RAF Brize Norton controllers work as casuals in the Kemble VCR, so additionally, no radar operator tactical level concerns exist for non reported incidents.			

14	CAP1122.05.02	<p>Do you understand the environment within which your aerodrome sits (i.e. Type of airspace and traffic patterns)</p> <p>This question seeks to elicit if the applicant has full awareness of the local environment i.e. controlled airspace etc.</p>	<p>Yes and understand Bristol SIDs, Brize STARS and SIDs and Fairford ILS. We, with consultation with the local GA and gliding community also understand where potential GA (under 3000ft) choke points are and areas of frequent use. This has been identified and developed through the CAP 1616 process and design options driven by engagement to account for this in our design proposals.</p>		<p>Answer does not align with previous responses, should read 'to a degree' [answer response is yes, to a degree, no]</p>	<p>Yes, we have identified several activities at the start of the CAP 1616 ACP process and engaged with key stakeholders.</p> <p>All the points below are mitigations for consideration into the IAP design, developed through ACP engagement under CAP 1616, not for current operations. These have included the Gliding Communities, BGGC at Nympsfield and Cotswold Gliding Club at more importantly at Aston Down, resulting in new Letters of Agreement being developed. This engagement led to a more comprehensive understanding of glider activities to the West of Kemble and activities which might impact on an RNAV approach to Kemble's RW08. Two forms of mitigation resulted from this engagement and the CAP 1616 design process.</p> <p>Firstly, an LOA was redrafted between Aston Down and Kemble to provide separation between gliders and the approach to RW08, which consequentially, also provide an fairly unused portion of our ATZ as a Saliplane Accessible Area (pre notified) to help route gliders away from the Kemble RW08 approach extended centreline. Secondly, account was taken (as described in the ACP Stage 2 Initial Appraisal, available on the CAA airspace change portal) to design options available in the west. This engagement, along with similar engagement with the NATS team at Bristol airport meant that the design for both currently proposed options (at this stage of the CAP 1616 process) incorporate a straight in approach to RW08, avoiding glider traffic and any potential airspace issues, in transition to the IAF, with Bristol.</p> <p>As an outcome of our close cooperation with RAF Brize Norton (as described in previous bow tie answers), through regular ATC level meetings and engagement specifically on Stage 2 of the CAP 1616 ACP, the design options in the east (for RW26) are being shaped to take account of Brize traffic, the potential 2021/22 RAF Fairford build up. Details have already been provided in the answer to Question 8 on current airspace routings outside Kemble's ATZ. This shaped option development for the approach for RW26 to avoid Class D airspace and any conflicts with low level transitions from STAR to approach to Brize Norton.</p> <p>For GA, as articulated in a previous answer, GA choke points, routing and PPL training areas have been identified (or previously known) as part of the Stage 2 CAP 1616 process. As an outcome, we are proactively trying to eradicate unhelpful chart symbology associated with South Cerney and its former use for parachuting which creates the false impression of a choke point, which may place GA traffic in conflict with any IAP approach to RW26. Additionally, to further mitigate, low standard charting symbology for AIRAC publication of our post Stage 5 submitted ICAO PAN OPS compliant IAP design, fan symbology will appear on the next updated UK South 1:500,000 chart and be instantly updated on electronic navigation charts/devices such as Runway HD and Skydemon. We are aware of all the other small GA sites in the vicinity such as Oaksey Park and have lines of communication open.</p> <p>Yes, and understand Bristol SIDs, Brize STARS and SIDs and Fairford ILS. We, with consultation with the local GA and gliding community also understand where potential GA (under 3000ft) choke points are and areas of frequent use. This has been identified and developed through the CAP 1616 process and design options driven by engagement to account for this in our design proposals.</p>		
15	CAP1122.05.03	<p>Have you developed any solutions (mitigation) to any issues you may have discovered through the analysis of traffic outside your ATZ</p> <p>Relates to the questions regarding your awareness of the local environment and analysis of traffic patterns.</p>	<p>Yes, Kemble and Brize Norton both want the South Cerney para drop zone symbol removing from the southern half and quarter mil charts. Additionally, we have an LOA with Brize Norton for our arriving and departing traffic and a new LOA with Aston Down for gliders, which was a product of engagement during Stage 2 of CAP 1616. An updated LOA is due to be signed before the Stage 3 CAP 1616 gateway with RAF Brize Norton and since RAF Fairford is starting to increase its operation, we have scheduled a meeting to develop an LOA directly with them (although their ATM</p>	LOA with Aston Down	<p>Answer inconsistent with 1122.04. Please provide details of the proposed LOA with RAF Brize Norton and Fairford.</p>	<p>As part of the engagement and design options development in our CAP 1616 ACP, see previous answer and attached (last Stage 3 Full Appraisal document).</p>		
16	CAP1122.05.04	<p>Have you dealt with (mitigated) any risks to a level which may be considered As Low As Reasonably Practicable (ALARP)?</p>	<p>Which risks does the question address?</p> <p>The only identified CAP 1122 risk, was a time expired MAC risk of aircraft transiting our ATZ, without requesting. This has been addressed and discussed during our recent Aerodrome Audit and the risk closed.</p> <p>There is no data of near misses (AirProx) on the proposed approach tracks and only 9 since 2000 within the ATZ. All have being reduced to ALARP, by both contextual change and process. All risk is measured through KARA (aerodrome risk assessments) and plotted to understand on a risk matrix. The monthly safety meeting reviews these risks and any reported incidents which may affect their ALARP status. Equally, any change management implications (internal and external is reviewed as an input to the safety meetings.) The purpose of the safety meeting is to review any incidents, review any opportunities and to ensure all risks remains ALARP.</p> <p>There remains some risk, we do not own, such as activities within Class G airspace and no clear mechanism, exists to transfer these risks. Any risk outside our ATZ (like</p>	LOA with Aston Down and LOA with Brize Norton	<p>Review of proposed LOAs required to resolve risk mitigations</p>	<p>LOAs will be updated prior to submission of the Stage 4 ACP designs for the IAP, until that is finalised it is difficult to be specific in any draft LOA. However, we anticipate including specific detail in the LOA with RAF Brize Norton to include: The SRD airways transition to the IAF, for both RW08 and RW26. The procedures for a missed approach and transition back to the IAF or to an alternate Airport The process for release between RAF Brize Norton and Kemble, including direct release from Sector 23 to Kemble.</p>		The content of the revised LOA with Brize Norton remains key to the safe integration of aircraft operating in the vicinity of the approach and missed approach areas.
17	CAP1122.06	<p>Is your DOC sufficient to have exchanges before the approach is commenced?</p> <p>Designated Operational Coverage (DOC)</p> <p>The term designated operational coverage is used to refer to the combination of the designated operational range and the designated operational height (e.g. 200 NM FL 500). (ICAO) DOC is that volume of airspace needed operationally in order to provide a particular service and within which the facility is afforded frequency protection. (B) NOTE: This term is usually associated with a frequency assignment to denote the volume of airspace in which it may be used.</p> <p>Can you pass information required for the approach within the DOC available? Runway details, weather, traffic information etc.</p>	<p>Yes, the current design proposal for the approach is within our current DOC. However, if the proposal is agreed, then during implementation, an application to extend maybe required.</p>		<p>The answer NO is correct, but an application to extend will be required, to allow effective management of the PPR process</p>	<p>The answer depends upon the final design and where the IAF is in relation to the DOC radius. For the purposes of the bow tie, we have answered the question and committed to a DOC increase, most likely to 25Nm (TBC), which appears to be the solution for similar, albeit CAP 725 applicants.</p> <p>No financial commitment will be made to change the DOC with OFCOM, until the ACP has been accepted and CAP 1616 process moves into Stage 5/6. Any extension to the DOC would allow extra time to pass information to the pilot prior to him/her starting the approach at the IAF, if not in receipt of a Brize radar service. In the latter, the direct line to all controller desks in Brize's radar room will allow Kemble to pass updated traffic information to Brize and thus onto the PIC.</p> <p>This is the same pragmatic approach as the EGNOS working agreement.</p>		
18	CAP1122.07	<p>Is there a surveillance equipped unit that can provide a service and is this part of your proposal?</p> <p>If yes - what level of local agreement is in place (LOA/MOU)? How is this promulgated?</p>	<p>RAF Brize Norton Zone on 119,000 and LARS on 124.275 See attached document from them. Kemble's demand for service from them is restricted due to operating hours in any case. The LOA with RAF Brize Norton is attached. The updated 2019 version to take account of our CAP 1616 proposal will be submitted with our Stage 3 gateway work.</p>	RAF Brize Norton CTR Crossing Guide, EGVN LOA Co-Ordination 2017, Stage 2 Kemble ACP Engagement Minutes - https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/umbraco/Surface/SponsorSurface/DownloadDocument/46	<p>Agreed content of 2019 LOA is required to allow this answer to be fully evaluated</p>	<p>Add 2019 Draft LOA attachment.</p> <p>Brize Radar is currently annotated on our AIP entry and we anticipate amending the LOA at Stage 4 of the ACP (as articulated in answer to the previous question). This will be promulgated on our updated AIP entry and on the RNAV IAP charts. RAF Brize Norton has an obligation to assist and (for its own safety) support inbound and outbound Kemble traffic from MALBY, as directed in the SRD. The detail in the proposed new LOA, we anticipate will include details on the transitional route from the SRD release from Sector 23 at MALBY to the IAF for the Kemble RNAV IAP.</p>		
19	CAP1122.08	<p>Is there any surveillance equipment that you are considering deploying</p> <p>If yes - how/when will this be introduced? Has a Training Needs Analysis/Safety Assessment been conducted?</p>	<p>Kemble is following closely the latest round of ADS-B trials currently underway. CAA acceptance and regulatory framework will need to be in place first before any commitment to proceed.</p>		<p>The answer should read possibly?</p>	<p>Changed Answer to Possibly</p>		
20	CAP1122.09	<p>Does the aerodrome accountable manager have permanent responsibility for the procedure?</p> <p>We are seeking to gain assurance through this question that there will be a local person accountable for the procedure.</p>	<p>Yes, the Airport Director as the accountable manager</p>	Nil	<p>Accepted</p>			
21	CAP1122.09.01	<p>Is there an individual who will be accountable on behalf of sponsor?</p>	<p>As above</p>	Nil	<p>Accepted</p>			
22	CAP1122.09.02	<p>Is there an individual who will be accountable for this procedure through its lifetime?</p>	<p>Yes, the incumbent Airport Director as the accountable manager.</p>	Nil	<p>Accepted</p>			
23	CAP1122.09.02.01	<p>Do you have an annual/biennial (every 2 years) plan to review the procedure?</p> <p>Please provide evidence of what this review will include i.e. Mandatory Occurrence Reports, Air Safety Reports, number of movements using the procedure etc</p>	<p>See KAOP 069 dealing with Quality Management Procedure, KAOP 060 Kemble Incident Reporting System (KIRS). KAOP 054 Air Traffic Engineering Failure Reporting System and KAOP 065 General Risk Assessment.</p> <p>As with all risks, both risks and reported incidents will be reviewed at monthly safety meetings (see aerodrome manual and demonstrated during our very recent aerodrome audit). Within the first year, the proposal will be reviewed as per CAP</p>	KAOP 60, KAOP 65	<p>Accepted</p>			
24	CAP1122.09.02.02	<p>Do you have a process whereby changes in airspace or traffic patterns will lead to a review of this procedure?</p>	<p>Yes, change of any sort is always captured within the KAOPS sms which will be triggered should airspace or traffic patterns alter. This is one of the listed inputs, to the safety meetings. A significant change would trigger a review of the process and associated risk assessments, LOAs etc.</p>		<p>Accepted</p>			
25	CAP1122.09.03	<p>Do you have a Safety Management System?</p>	<p>Aerodrome Manual (and supporting ATC, Fire and Ops Manuals and supporting KAOP procedures) Audited and approved by both Aerodrome and ATM inspectors. See KAOP 050 Change Process Form and KAOP 060 Quality Management Procedure</p>		<p>Accepted</p>			
26	CAP1122.09.03.01	<p>If you do not have a safety management system do you have a process to conduct ongoing management/oversight of this procedure?</p>	<p>This is a badly worded question. As we have an SMS already stated in previously neither yes or no is appropriate in the light of that.</p>		<p>Accepted</p>			

27	CAP1122.09.04	Have you checked the guidance in CAP 760 to assist you with your safety assessment?		CAP760 is being used now to construct the Safety Arguments in support of the proposal for CAP 1616 Stage 4. It will adopt the 7 stage process as outlined there-in. Initial safety assessments and arguments have matured through the CAP 1616 and the latest safety assessment is included in the Stage 3 submission for the end of Jun 2020.		Accepted		
28	CAP1122.10	Have you an analysis of traffic levels on poor weather days and the likely use of this procedure It is acknowledged that on poor weather days when the proposed procedure is likely to be used, there may be a different mix of aircraft type and numbers.		Airports Red Atlas software analysis tool. Too much information to attach here, but the system records all movement and has been corroborated with reported Wx (VMC or IMC) days. On IMC days, very few GA aircraft operate.		Please support this answer with the stated analysis	Over the last 12 months, we have reported 26 IMC days where the airport was open and 9 IMC Closed days. On an IMC day in the summer, the average daily movements are 159 (arguably, in the summer IMC develops into a VMC day and only the daily IMC condition is recorded). In the winter months, the average movement on an IMC day are 17.1 movements. This is most likely periods where the weather Vis and ceiling sufficiently improves to VMC minima, otherwise only IMC traffic will operate. Three of the based flying schools/ATOs operate IMC equipped aircraft. In terms of procedural use of the IAP. I anticipate all current corporate jet traffic to use the approach (131 movements 1 Oct 18 to 1 Oct 19 data). Additionally, although difficult to measure an unknown, the average lost movements from one operator alone is 19 per annum, made up from cancellations due to weather, cancellations due to the operators operating manual not allowing a non-defined approach and diversions. Predictions in the CAP 1616 ACP Full Appraisal anticipate that based on the current steady growth and the known cancellations, suggest an annual usage of this approach to be c200 movements (c18 per month), which I anticipate growing over the subsequent years. We have proposed a PPR slot system of a maximum number of slots available per day at 5. I don't anticipate more than 3 slots on any given day would be used, worst case.	
29	CAP1122.10.01	Have you conducted an analysis of traffic mix on poor weather days?		Airports Red Atlas software analysis tool. Too much information to attach here, but the system records all movement and has been corroborated with reported Wx (VMC or IMC) days. On IMC days, very few GA aircraft operate.		Please support this answer with the stated analysis	As per the previous answer. Traffic mix analysis of RedAtlas data over the past 12 months, shows the bulk of the traffic (over 76%) is under 2750 kg MTOW and therefore either microlights or SEP. Currently, our biggest limitation is that the aircraft in scope to the ACP and this bowtie do not arrive in IMC; prohibited by their own operational manual/risk without a defined approach. The development of a defined RNAV approach, will change the traffic mix, allowing more corporate jets to arrive; anticipated demand is articulated in the previous answer.	
30	CAP1122.12	Have you considered how these proposed instrument procedures will be promulgated?		There are internationally recognised methods to notify a new IAP which will be employed using AIRAC, see KAOP 040 UKAIP Change and Promulgation. Other channels of communications will include airport briefings to stakeholders, Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi Webex GoTo Bluebeam PDFelement Acrobat Adobe Microsoft Apple Google Amazon Facebook Twitter YouTube LinkedIn Instagram Nextdoor WhatsApp Telegram Signal Discord Slack Skype Zoom Jitsi				

37	CAP1122.18.01	Will you be incorporating a hold into your planned instrument approach procedure?	See justification in CAP 1616 submissions.		No Justification Present	The matter of a hold has been considered and the following is provided as the rationale as to why a hold is unnecessary. The inclusion of a hold for the instrument procedures at Kemble had been evaluated at the very early stages of the design process and was assessed to be unnecessary and potentially unhelpful. Early engagement in the ACP process didn't include a discussion about a hold, particularly with the gliding community for the RW08 approach. To add a hold at this stage, would require reengagement and undermine the ACP process to date. CAP1122 makes two passing references to 'holds' deliberately. It is guidance material for applicants to help enable them to propose a safe way to introduce new methods of navigation. ICAO PANS OPS Doc 8168 contains the "how-to-design" an approach; CAP1122 the way new risks created by such designs could be made acceptable to the Regulator. IFR arrivals to the procedure are sequenced and regulated by slots which are strictly enforced. The slot length is 30 minutes which allows for an initial approach of 8 minutes, followed by a missed approach of 12 minutes and finally a second approach of 8 minutes. The slot time starts when the inbound aircraft arrives at the initial approach fix. Slots are separated by a safety margin of at 30 minutes before and after to ensure that only one aircraft is using the procedure at any one time. stakeholder engagement showed demand likely to be in the order of 1-2 per day initially. Subsequent changes to commercial activities by these entities have reduced demand further. The decision not to incorporate a hold in the designs was fully supported by the chief pilots of the commercial operators currently using Kemble, such as the Royal Flight. A hold would serve no purpose for traffic flow management and integration: The procedure is flown and managed by the pilot operating the aircraft as there is no approach control service sequencing and integrating traffic. Safe operation is achieved by ensuring that there is only one IFR aircraft per slot and all VFR arrivals and departures are stopped whilst the procedure is operation. There is no requirement for an IFR arrival to hold waiting for other traffic before commencing the procedure. A hold would cause unnecessary environmental impact: In the absence of an approach control service, aircraft would be required to fly the hold after a missed approach as the procedure would have to be flown as published, even if the preference was to return directly to the IAF. This would require the aircraft to fly more track miles, unnecessarily generating both noise and CO2 emissions and reduce fuel reserves further. A hold would be of limited use in the event of poorer than forecast weather: The slot length limits the amount of time that the procedure is available to the inbound aircraft, at the expiry of the slot aircraft will be instructed that the aerodrome is no longer available to them. Should an aircraft choose to hold after a missed approach to wait for an improvement in the weather then it is extremely unlikely that it could complete a further approach within the allotted time. Pre-application stakeholder engagement revealed that recovery operations from planned tasks required weather be considered, including remaining on the ground at departure aerodromes until an assured end to the flight was likely. In the event of a sudden and unexpected deterioration in the weather towards company operating minima, their CAA approved FOM would dictate actions in the event of a missed approach. A hold would be of limited use in the event of unforeseen circumstances: Unforeseen circumstances such as a blocked or contaminated runway take time for the ground staff to resolve. In those circumstances it is extremely unlikely that an aircraft could hold and subsequently complete even a single approach within the allotted time slot. Risk mitigations: Traffic management is safely achieved through the slot system and ceasing of VFR operations in the ATZ. Risks associated with a/c flying in Class G in IMC have already been dealt with by the Government	
38	CAP1122.19	Has the procedure design included all terrain clearance safety requirements?	Designed by Pildo (a CAA approved and recently audited) designer with access to CAP232 Class 2 obstacle database, XVOD obstacle database (31/1/19) and OS Terrain 50 for natural obstacles	Draft Stage 3 Full Appraisal	Unable to verify at this stage of the project	Draft designs are included in the Stage 3 Submission Full Appraisal, attached. [to attach] , noting this will be reworked for the Stage 3 gateway, yet the ATS arguments and text will remain extant.	Verification by CAA IFP Dept required
39	Complex.01.03.02	Do you have a procedure to check the runway is clear of obstructions? As well as having the ability to check the runway for obstructions, this question is trying to elicit if there is a written procedure that governs and controls how such checking might be done.	Yes. Runway and all movements surfaces inspected twice per day and additionally inspected prior to any in-cope aircraft arrivals. See KAOP 1, 24 and 61.	KAOP01, 24 and 61	Accepted		
40	CAP1122.01.05	Do you have a method to manage arriving IFR traffic at your aerodrome? This is to determine how you might control the flow of aircraft using the procedure to minimise the risk of conflict between two or more aircraft using the proposed procedure at once.	This is the third question to ask essentially the same question. The PPR/Slot allocation system helps ensure separation.		AFISO does not have the privileges associated with management of airborne flights. How is deconfliction to be considered within the 2019 LOA (with Brize)	There is no "requirement" to provide separation between VFR and IFR traffic in class G airspace. It is correct to state that a FISO cannot enter into agreements, however the acceptance of agreements by pilots are not mandatory and CAP 774 para 1.7 warns of the limitations of such agreements. Aircraft remaining clear of the ATZ whilst during an IAP will be operating in class G airspace and in receipt of a basic service. To reduce the risk reduce of a mid-air collision they will have been advised of both the instrument traffic and of other known traffic operating in the vicinity and will however, in accordance with the rules applicable to class G airspace, remain responsible for their own traffic and terrain collision avoidance. Additionally, IAP "feathers" will be promulgated on aeronautical charts. VFR traffic will be requested to remain clear of the IAP area. APP/ADI airfields currently only achieve such cleared airspace within the ATZ. Outside of the ATZ is a Class G environment; pilots are given clear guidance surrounding IAPs in class G airspace and remain responsible for their own collision avoidance CAP1535 page 70 & 72 refer. Whilst not able to enter into agreements, AFISOs are able to issue warnings to traffic when it is considered that a definite risk of collision exists. CAP 797 para 8.17 refers. We will ensure that all AFISOs are reminded of the guidance provided in CAP 797 to ensure compliance with national standards.	
41	CAP1122.01.05.01	Do you have a plan to manage other aircraft in association with IFR arriving traffic?	Yes see ATS and AFISO Manual V9 effective 1st May 2018 Chapter 10 Flight Planning. The airport authority will close the airport and circuit for the duration of the allocated slot.		please confirm the reference for the airport closure procedure	Currently, an arriving flights progress is monitored via FlightRadar24 or Radar360 just for situational awareness and a slot can easily be altered to suit an arriving aircraft arrival. Tactical decisions can then be made to clear the ATZ at the appropriate time. Traffic flow inbound is also subject to other agencies that liaise with Kemble AFISO, such as sector 23 and RAF Brize Norton to update and all preparations for arrival. In a use case scenario for the active IAP, An inbound jet will PPR an arrival slot (maximum 5 slots per day). Each slot is separated by 1.5 hrs. In this scenario, the jet has PPR'd onto slot 2 (1100). The jet has an early arrival buffer of 1045, and allocated slot start of 1100, a slot complete time of 1130 and an overrun buffer to 1145. As a PPR Airport, we would not accept PPR bookings for this slot period, which just then leaves the based GA traffic to be tactically managed for arrival and departure. Arriving from the national airways system, the SRD states MALBY for Kemble arrivals (although Sector 23 has been known to drop them out at SIREN). Both are also (2 of 6) RAF Brize NORTON SRD entries for their STARS. Within the bounds of the current LOA, on pre-notification (via AFPEX) Kemble inbounds from the airways is provided with a LARS service (within irreducible capacity) to deconflict with any RAF Brize Norton or Fairford active STARS or SIDs. Positioning advice will be given to the IAF. If the jet is in receipt of a radar service from RAF Brize Norton, Brize will confirm the aircraft is at the IAF by telephone to Kemble VCR, before handing the jet to Kemble. If the aircraft is flying VFR and not in receipt of a radar service, the proposed AIP entry will require the PIC to confirm he is ready to commence the IAP and time on the IAF. This will then set a time for the IAP to be flown and thus allow any tactical management of based traffic. Any traffic yet to depart Kemble, will be held on the ground (under the positive control privileges of a FISO). Traffic information will be provided to all PPR approaching traffic and that holding on the ground. If the jet cannot continue to approach, through defined operating minima for the IAP (RVR and 500ft DH), or the runway is blocked, the jet may have to execute a go-around or missed approach. Our missed approach procedure is anticipated to work for the IAP as it does now. The jet would climb out, we would pre-notify this to RAF Brize Norton on the dedicated phone line in Kemble's VCR, which rings at all controller stations at RAF Brize Norton. We anticipate the IAP design will incorporate a closed loop transition back to the IAF. We would request the jet reports leaving the ATZ and suggest he changes frequency back to Brize. Once the jet is confirmed clear of the ATZ, the PPR aircraft and those in the overhead or waiting on the ground can then be tactically managed. It is unlikely that the aircraft will be able to remain within its current IAP slot; if the visibility or cloud base is below the IAP minima, it is unlikely to change quick enough and the aircraft would be advised to divert to its alternative airport. Obstacles on the runway or within the transitional area are likely to deliver the same outcome. Once the aircraft has landed, the IAP slot allocation would be wound up as the aircraft lands and this confirmed with RAF Brize Norton, via the telephone link. In terms of integrating departing IFR traffic. Kemble will pre notify RAF Brize Norton on the dedicated phone line. At present, Brize will provide an IFR release from Kemble, with a Squawk. The Brize Release allows Brize to manage any conflicting traffic with the Kemble departing IFR traffic.	
42	CAP1122.03.01	Do you currently provide ATS?	Yes, Kemble provides an approved FIS. See ATS and AFISO Manual V9 effective 1st May 2018		Accepted		
43	CAP1122.05.05	Do you have an air to ground communications capability? How would you handle any lack of ability to conduct air to ground communications	Air to Ground communications are accomplished using VHF r/t on 118.430. The voice switch has two separate power feeds one being a UPS. Reversion in case of comms failure relies on deploying the Airfield Ops vehicle "Checker" with a driver and FISO. AFISO/ATS Manual. Para 7.2.6 refers to radio failure (Pag 26)		Accepted		
44	CAP1122.05.06	Is your ATZ subject to regular infringement? This question is part of ensuring you understand the environment around your aerodrome and what might impact the traffic using the procedure	Although some historic concerns had previously been raised. No MORs or Airprox in the last 6+ years for ATZ infringement.		Please review this answer, there would appear to be a number of ATZ infringements reported within the stated period and ATZ infringements has been previously stated as a unit significant risk	Kemble has all recorded incidents KIR and any associated MORs back to 2006. In the past 10 years, we have had two reported ATZ infringement incidents, both in the spring of 2017. In both cases the aircraft were flying to local grass strips/airfields and both were reported by AFISOs in the VCR and no AIRPROX raised. In each year, the average years KIRS reported/recorded are 44.9. Over the past 10 years, with over 450 KIRS and only 2 reported ATZ infringement KIRS, I consider this a negligible risk, which I consider ALARP.	
45	CAP1122.09.02.03	Do you have a plan to conduct a review of this procedure after 5 years?	SMS regular reviews are accomplished at shorter periods.		Accepted		
46	CAP1122.09.02.03.01	Do you have a process to capture lessons to be considered in the routine and 5 yearly reviews	Yes as part of the Safety Management System and monthly safety meetings, see aerodrome manual.		Accepted		

47	CAP1122.09.05	Is there an existing process that drives routine review of this procedure? i.e. will you be adapting an existing process to review this proposed instrument procedure?		Yes SMS see KAOP 069 Quality Management Procedures		Accepted	
48	CAP1122.18.02	Will you accept non-radio traffic at your aerodrome whilst this procedure will be available?		See UK AIP EGBP AD 2.20 Local Aerodrome Regulations 1 b) and ATS and AFISO Manual V9 effective 1st May 2018 Chapter 3 Local Aircraft Procedures para 3.4 Non-Radio Equipped Aircraft		Accepted	
49	CAP1122.20	Are you considering having a maximum limit on movements before this procedure is withdrawn? This question is written to elicit answers so that we can understand how the proposed instrument procedure will be used in practice		Another question which has already been asked in a different form . Maximum 5 slots per date. in reality, based on analysis in the CAP 1616 work, worst case would see 3 aircraft per day using the approach; there is little different between current operations of in-scope aircraft following a self defined approach, in terms of movements and traffic integration.		Accepted	
50	CAP1122.21	Will this procedure be available on all weather days? For example, will it be used on VMC days as well as during poor weather?		A proportion of the a/c these approaches are intended to serve are jet airliners operated by international airlines or leasing companies. Although these are their last flights the companies SOPS are still followed. This includes the requirement to fly a defined approach not a hand flown visual one.		What consideration has been given to traffic volumes and workload on VMC days?	These in scope aircraft currently arrive on VMC days; their Op manual generally precludes their arrival in IMC without a defined approach. If anything, the volume of traffic may reduce on VMC days, since in scope aircraft will be able to arrive on IMC or VMC Minima days. The PPR system, for both the IAP and GA traffic allows capacity to be managed. (as articulated in previous answers). With summer excesses of c300 movements per day currently, I don't anticipate hitting capacity; noting that the PPR slot system will reduce the availability of the airport for arriving GA for the period of the approach, which in practical terms will serve to reduce max daily movements, should the approach be used.
51	CAP1122	Have you completed the questionnaire and provided further detail/evidence where it is asked for?		?		Clarification required for a number of the answers	