

CAA Consultation Assessment

Title of airspace change proposal	St Athan Instrument Landing System
Change Sponsor	Welsh Government
Project Reference	ACP-2018-35
SARG Lead	[REDACTED]
Case study commencement date	12 th November 2019
Case study report as at	10 th July 2020
<p><i>Instructions</i></p> <p>In providing a response for each question, please ensure that the 'status' column is completed using the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YES • NO • PARTIALLY • N/A <p>To aid the SARG Lead it may be useful that each question is also highlighted accordingly to illustrate what is:</p> <p>resolved YES not resolved PARTIALLY not compliant NO</p>	
<p>Executive Summary</p> <p>This regulatory assessment concerns the consultation undertaken by the Welsh Government (the change sponsor) in support of their proposal to publish the Runway 25 Instrument Landing System (ILS) flight procedure, previously published in the Military Aeronautical Information Publication (Mil AIP), into its civilian counterpart, the UK Aeronautical Information Publication (UK AIP).</p> <p>On the 1st April 2019, St Athan transitioned from Military Aviation Authority (MAA) oversight to become a fully regulated and licensed civil aerodrome under the CAA's oversight. As a consequence, the ILS flight procedure needed to be approved by the CAA and published in the UK AIP, hence the need for the Welsh Government to initiate the airspace change process. The procedure was therefore suspended on the 1st April 2019 and the change sponsor felt that this made the aerodrome a "less attractive" option for aircraft operators whilst highlighting the importance of St Athan's Maintenance and Repair Organisation (MRO) facilities to Cardiff Airport, the St Athan Enterprise Zone and the local economy.</p> <p>Given the scope and anticipated impact of this airspace change proposal, the CAA had agreed that it was appropriate to consult in a "targeted and proportional" manner (see minutes of meeting on 4th June 2019).</p>	

The change sponsor completed a 4-week targeted consultation, which presented five 'options' to stakeholders:

- Permanently withdraw the ILS (discounted)
- Introduce Area Navigation (RNAV) procedures instead of ILS through a full (level 1) airspace change application
- Publish the ILS procedures in the UK as a Level 0 change
- Publish the ILS procedures in the UK AIP following a full, Level 1 CAP 1616 process
- Publish the ILS procedures in the UK AIP following a scaled, proportionate and accelerated application of CAP 1616 (preferred option)

A total of 21 responses were received during the consultation, with 20 consultees confirming their 'support' for the airspace change proposal and 1 stating that they were 'neutral'. No modifications were made to the airspace change proposal following this consultation.

The fundamental principles of effective consultation are targeting the right audience, communicating in a way that suits them, and giving them the tools to make informative, valuable contributions to the proposal's development. I am satisfied that these principles have been applied by the change sponsor before, during and after the consultation. I am also satisfied that the change sponsor has conducted this consultation in accordance with the requirements of CAP 1616 and that they have demonstrated the Government's consultation principles.

PART A – Summary of Airspace Change Process to date

A.1	https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?pID=81	
A.2	Stage 1 DEFINE Gateway	26/07/2019
A.2.1	The required documentation was presented on time and we were satisfied that the change sponsor had met the requirements of the Process up to that point. Progress to the next Step of the Process was therefore approved.	
A.3	Stage 2 DEVELP & ASSESS Gateway	26/07/2019
A.2.1	The required documentation was presented on time and we were satisfied that the change sponsor had met the requirements of the Process up to that point. Progress to the next Step of the Process was therefore approved.	
A.3	Stage 3 CONSULT Gateway	27/09/2019
A.3.2	The required documentation was presented on time and we were satisfied that the change sponsor had met the requirements of the Process up to that point. Progress to the next Step of the Process was therefore approved.	
A.4	Stage 4 UPDATE & SUBMIT	05/11/2019

A.4.1	The change sponsor formally submitted their proposal, which included all of the required documentation.	
PART B – Consultation Assessment		
B.1	AUDIENCE	
B.1.1	Did the consultation target the right audience?	YES
	<p>As part of their consultation preparation, the change sponsor considered the stakeholders likely to be affected by this airspace change proposal by grouping them in to three categories - Local Communities, Aviation Stakeholders, Environmental Stakeholders. These categories were listed within the change sponsors Consultation Strategy along with a narrative stating the anticipated impact and the change sponsors intentions for each group – the contents have been summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Communities – having concluded that approval and implementation of the preferred option would not lead to any changes to tracks over the ground and/or traffic levels, the change sponsor targeted the elected representatives which sit on the Cardiff Airport Consultative Committee. • Aviation Stakeholders – the change sponsor targeted the MRO companies based at the aerodrome and those aviation stakeholders that operate or have an interest in the controlled airspace in the vicinity of St Athan. General aviation stakeholders and/or members of the National Air Traffic Management Advisory Committee (NATMAC) were not targeted as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the procedures are almost entirely contained within the controlled airspace environment ○ aircraft have continued to fly a visual equivalent of the ILS procedure since it's suspension ○ a very small number of aircraft will utilise the procedure (if approved and implemented) ○ all of those stakeholders most likely to utilise the procedure (if approved and implemented) have been identified and will be targeted • Environmental Stakeholders – the change sponsor opted not to target environmental stakeholders on the basis that there would be <i>“no perceived or actual change in environmental impact nor can any be predicted with any degree of confidence”</i>. <p>The consultation strategy was assessed and approved at the CONSULT Gateway on the 27th September 2019, with the CAA determining that it represented an <i>“entirely proportionate and pragmatic approach to take in the circumstances”</i>.</p>	
B.1.2	Please provide a summary of responses below	
	<p>A total of 21 responses were received during the 4-week consultation, all of which were submitted online via the Airspace Change Portal (Citizen Space). The change sponsor produced a basic questionnaire to collate related feedback which prompted consultees to confirm whether they supported or objected to the proposal; 95% (20 out of 21) of the consultees confirmed their support, with the remaining 5% (1 out of 21) confirming they were neutral.</p>	

	With regards to the latter, the consultee stated that they would only have concerns if the level of traffic operating to/from the aerodrome along the A4226 and A4050 increased as a result of the approval and implementation of the proposal. In response, the change sponsor confirmed that <i>“no increase in number of aircraft planned if proposal accepted, therefore no increase in road traffic is predicted”</i> .
B.2	APPROACH
B.2.1	Did the change sponsor consult stakeholders in a suitable way? YES
	The change sponsor utilised the Airspace Change Portal (Citizen Space) functionality to consult with stakeholders and consequently their approach was aligned with the requirements of CAP 1616 (see Step 3A).
B.2.2	What steps did the change sponsor take to encourage stakeholders to engage in the consultation?
	<p>The engagement activities conducted by the change sponsor during the DEFINE and DEVELOP & ASSESS stages of the airspace change process helped to ensure that the targeted stakeholders were both prepared and informed.</p> <p>Targeted stakeholders were sent a launch email on the 30th September 2019, notifying them that the consultation was open, the dates and duration of the consultation and a link to the relevant section of the Airspace Change Portal. Follow-up emails were distributed to those targeted stakeholders that had not responded on the 11th and 21st October 2019; these emails confirmed the end date of the consultation, included a link to the relevant section of the Airspace Change Portal and highlighted the importance of consultee feedback in terms of progressing the airspace change proposal.</p>
B.2.3	Was the change sponsor required to respond to any unexpected events and/or challenges? N/A
	Not applicable in this instance.
B.3	MATERIALS
B.3.1	What materials were used by the change sponsor during the consultation?
	As detailed above the change sponsor used the Airspace Change Portal (Citizen Space) to create a related consultation site. The site included a narrative which provided an overview of the main aim/purpose of the consultation and clearly articulated the scope of it. An image displayed the <i>“airspace of interest”</i> and the consultation document itself was embedded on to the site. The 17-page consultation document included the following sections:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction – narrative providing the background/context for pursuing an airspace change proposal, an introduction to the airspace change process and the purpose of the consultation. • About this Consultation – narrative detailing the aim and overview of the consultation (including a clear explanation of what’s in and out of scope), the duration, the stakeholder groups most likely to have an interest and the anticipated impact of the proposal on them and an acknowledgement of the previous engagement activities undertaken. • Options Considered – a narrative covering the various options considered along with a rationale explaining why they were discounted (where applicable). The change sponsor clearly stated their preferred option (publish the pre-existing ILS procedures in the UK Civil AIP having followed a proportionate CAP 1616 process) and articulated what they determined the associated benefits and impacts would be. • Consultation Participation - instructions on how to respond to the consultation (via the Portal with postal responses accepted – a postal address was provided), along with guidance on what happens to consultation responses and next steps post consultation. • Appendix – aeronautical chart depicting the ILS extended centreline and its containment within Cardiff’s controlled airspace and a satellite representation taken from Google Earth displaying the ILS procedure over the ground. 	
B.3.2	Did the materials provide stakeholders with enough information to ensure that they understood the issue(s) and potential impact(s) on them?	YES
	<p>The change sponsor articulated the purpose of the consultation and provided a clear explanation of what was in and out of scope within the consultation document. They have provided the reader with enough information to help them understand the current situation and determine what the likely impact of the change sponsor’s preferred option would be on them if it was approved and implemented; the change sponsor provided a “<i>benefits and impacts</i>” narrative under the following headings for their preferred option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predictability for airline operations to St Athan • Economic benefits for St Athan region • Noise, visual intrusion, fuel and CO2 • Impacts on other airspace users • Impacts on communities 	
B.4	LENGTH	
B.4.1	Please confirm the start/end dates and the duration of the consultation below	

	Start Date: 30 th September 2019 End Date: 28 th October 2019 Duration: 4-weeks
B.4.2	If duration was less than 12 weeks, what was the justification?
	Whilst they acknowledged that the accepted and widely recognised standard for consultation is 12-weeks, the change sponsor pursued a targeted approach to their consultation and a reduced 4-week consultation period on the basis that the proposal would <i>“not alter the historical track, altitude or the number of aircraft arriving at St Athan, nor the classification or dimensions of surrounding airspace”</i> . The change sponsor also highlighted that stakeholders had been made aware of their desire to pursue a reduced 4-week consultation period when they were engaged at the DEFINE and DEVELOP & ASSESS stages of the airspace change process, stating in their ‘Consultation Strategy’ document that <i>“all those with whom initial discussions have been held are content with the suggested abbreviated consultation period”</i> .
B.4.3	Was the period of consultation proportionate?
	YES
	The scope of this consultation was essentially limited to the implementation (or not) of the change sponsors preferred option. Taking this into account and the fact that the targeted stakeholders were a prepared and informed audience, the reduced 4-week consultation period was entirely proportionate in the circumstances.
B.5	GENERAL
B.5.1	Was the conduct of the consultation aligned with the consultation strategy?
	PARTIALLY
	<p>The consultation was, for the most part, aligned with the consultation strategy that was approved at the CONSULT gateway; the following discrepancies are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The sponsor will maintain full records of engagement activity”</i> – whilst the change sponsor has provided copies of outgoing correspondence and the ‘raw’ Citizen Space response data, there is no evidence to suggest the change sponsor maintained a ‘consultation record sheet’ to track the stakeholders approached, when they were chased, when their feedback was received, a summary of their feedback, confirmation of whether a standard acknowledgement and/or bespoke response was dispatched and what has happened as a result of their feedback. This is a very useful way for a consultor to track their engagement with all stakeholders (i.e. those initially targeted as well as others that respond) throughout the consultation. • <i>“Cardiff airport has kindly agreed to support St Athan in publicly advertising the consultation”</i> – the consultation strategy clearly stated that Cardiff airport would post a notice directing readers to the relevant section of the Airspace Change Portal and informing them of the consultation deadline. No evidence has been provided to confirm that this was

	<p>done and best efforts to locate the related entry on the Cardiff airport website have proved unsuccessful.</p> <p>Whilst these points are noted for the purpose of this assessment, it is reasonable to conclude, given the scope of this particular consultation, that they did not in any way undermine the success of it.</p>	
B.5.2	Has the change sponsor categorised the responses in accordance with CAP 1616?	YES
	<p>Within the 'Collate and Review Responses' document, the change sponsor has categorised the responses in accordance with CAP 1616 (see Appendix C, Table C2).</p> <p>In completing their analysis, the change sponsor concluded that <i>"no responses contained new information or ideas that the sponsor believes could lead to an adaptation to the preferred design option, a new design option, or would otherwise impact the final proposal"</i>. Consequently, all 21 responses were identified as <i>"responses which do not impact the final proposals"</i>.</p>	
B.5.3	Has the change sponsor correctly identified all of the issues raised during the consultation?	PARTIALLY
	<p>The change sponsor has included a narrative within their 'Collate and Review Responses' document (see Paragraph 1.4.2) which states that most responses <i>"contain useful and relevant comments"</i> before explaining that <i>"six themes"</i> were identified during the subsequent analysis; these are inserted below for ease of reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The availability of ILS procedures enhances the safety of operations; • The availability of ILS procedures enhances the operational planning, and therefore the commercial attractiveness of St Athan as a location for MRO; • Local airspace users and ANSPs identified no negative and some positive impact of the proposal; • The proposal elicited no negative operational or aviation-related comments; • The suspension of the ILS procedures is having a significant, negative, economic impact on the local area and the region at a time of already heightened uncertainty; • The early reinstatement of the St Athan ILS procedures would be welcomed. <p>Given that there is significant support for this airspace change proposal, it is unsurprising that these themes are of a positive nature. It is therefore reasonable for the change sponsor to conclude that the consultation responses provide <i>"further supportive evidence of the benefits that will accrue if the proposal is accepted and the St Athan ILS procedures are re-introduced"</i>.</p> <p>When cross-checking the narrative with Table A3 (consultation responses) and the raw data downloaded from Citizen Space, it was noted that were some other <i>"useful and relevant comments"</i> that prompted the change sponsor to take post-consultation</p>	

	<p>actions which could have been better signposted in the narrative referenced above – these are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wales Air Ambulance Trading Ltd expressed concern about the proximity of the Cardiff Docks Visual Report Point (VRP) to Cardiff Heliport. • NATS Cardiff and Cardiff airport asked specific questions regarding the approach procedures (circling approach/minima and missed approach procedure). • Barry Town Council highlighted that they would only be concerned if road traffic on the A4226 and A4050 increased as a consequence of the approval/implementation of the airspace change proposal. 	
B.5.4	<p>Does the consultation feedback report accurately capture all of the issues raised during the consultation?</p>	YES
	<p>Notwithstanding the comments made above, the change sponsor has accurately captured all of the feedback from consultees within their 'Collate and Review Responses' document. They have transposed the free text submitted by each consultee via the Airspace Change Portal (Citizen Space) questionnaire in its entirety and included it within Table A3.</p>	
B.5.5	<p>Does the consultation feedback report detail the change sponsor's response to the identified issues?</p>	YES
	<p>Table A3 in the 'Collate and Review Responses' document includes "<i>Justification of no impact on final proposal</i>" and "<i>Sponsor Action</i>" columns and these have been used by the change sponsor to document their response to those "<i>useful and relevant comments</i>" from four consultees which required post-consultation action.</p>	
B.5.6	<p>Is the change sponsor's response to the issues raised appropriate/adequate?</p>	YES
	<p>The "<i>useful and relevant comments</i>" which prompted the change sponsor to take post-consultation action to ensure that they were addressed accordingly are listed below along with a summary of the actions taken as per the contents of Table A3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wales Air Ambulance Trading Ltd expressed concern about the proximity of the Cardiff Docks Visual Report Point (VRP) to Cardiff Heliport. The change sponsor acknowledged the input in their 'Collate and Review Responses' document, clearly stating that this matter is "<i>not relevant to the ACP</i>" and that the "<i>issue has been passed to the relevant authority</i>". The change sponsor has provided evidence which confirms that they responded to this consultee to advise them that the relevant authority for this matter was NATS Cardiff, providing them with a direct point of contact who was copied in on the email response. • NATS Cardiff queried the lack of reference to tracks over the ground for runway 07 (highlighting that the procedures detail a circling approach) and missed approach procedures. The change sponsor responded by email confirming that they would ensure that references to runway 07 circling approaches and missed approach procedures would be 	

	<p>contained in the formal airspace change proposal submission to the CAA and the related 'Sponsor Action' entry on Table A3 states <i>"observation addressed in Final Options Appraisal"</i>. The 'Final Options Appraisal' document clarifies that <i>"the circling minima at St Athan remains unchanged and that no circling approach is published"</i> whilst also confirming that the <i>"missed approach...is unchanged and relies on national procedures i.e. climb straight ahead to 3000 ft and contact ATC"</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cardiff Airport also queried whether a circling approach would be included within the procedures, with the change sponsor acknowledging this input in their 'Collate and Review Response' document and confirming that it would be addressed in the 'Final Options Appraisal'. • Barry Town Council confirmed that members of the Council's Consultation Working Party Group would only have concerns if the level of road traffic along the A4226 and A4050 were to increase as a result of the approval and implementation of this proposal. Whilst it has not been possible to determine whether the change sponsor responded directly to this consultee, the 'Collate and Review Responses' document acknowledges their input, clearly stating that <i>"no increase in number of aircraft predicted...therefore no increase in road traffic is predicted"</i>. 	
B.5.7	Is the formal airspace change proposal aligned with the conclusions of the consultation feedback report?	YES
	Whilst no fundamental change was made to the airspace change proposal following consultation, the change sponsor updated their Stage 4 documentation to provide clarity on circling minima and missed approach procedures.	
B.6	RECOMMENDATIONS/CONDITIONS/PIR DATA REQUIREMENTS	
B.6.1	Are there any Recommendations which the change sponsor <u>should try</u> to address either before or after implementation (if approved)? If yes, please list them below.	N/A
	Not applicable in this instance.	
B.6.2	Are there any Condition(s) which the change sponsor <u>must fulfil</u> either before or after implementation (if approved)? If yes, please list them below.	N/A
	Not applicable in this instance.	

B.6.3	Are there any specific requirements in terms of the data to be collected by the change sponsor for the Post Implementation Review (if approved)? If yes, please list them below.	YES
<p><u>STAKEHOLDER OBSERVATIONS</u></p> <p>The change sponsor is required to collate related stakeholder observations (enquiry/complaint data) and present it to the CAA. Any location/area from where more than 10 individuals have made enquiries/complaints must be plotted on separate maps displaying a representative sample of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aircraft track data plots; and • traffic density plots <p>The plots should include a typical days-worth of movements from the last month of each standard calendar quarter (March, June, September, December) from each of the years directly preceding and following implementation of the airspace change proposal.</p>		
PART C – Consultation Assessment Conclusion(s)		
C.1	Does the consultation meet the CAA’s regulatory requirements, the Government’s guidance principles for consultation and the Secretary of State’s Air Navigation Guidance?	YES
<p>The fundamental principles of effective consultation are targeting the right audience, communicating in a way that suits them, and giving them the tools to make informative, valuable contributions to the proposal’s development. I am satisfied that these principles have been applied by the change sponsor before, during and after the consultation. I am also satisfied that the change sponsor has conducted this consultation in accordance with the requirements of CAP 1616, that they have demonstrated the Government’s consultation principles and that the consultation has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taken place when the proposal was at a formative stage. Whilst the scope of this consultation was essentially limited to the implementation (or not) of the change sponsors preferred option (publish the pre-existing ILS procedures following a scaled, proportionate and accelerated application of CAP 1616), other options were presented for consideration with the change sponsor making it clear that <i>“where possible, specific responses and/or themes will influence the development of the final submission to the CAA”</i>. • Presented the consultation material clearly and outlined the potential impacts that needed to be considered. The change sponsor clearly articulated the purpose and mandate for consultation, providing stakeholders with enough information to help them understand the current situation and determine what the likely impact of the proposal would be on them if approved and implemented. 		

- **Provided a sufficient timeframe to allow considered responses.** Although it was shorter than the accepted and widely recognised standard of 12-weeks, the scope of the consultation was essentially limited to the implementation (or not) of the change sponsors preferred option. Taking this into account and the fact that the change sponsor was targeting a prepared and informed audience, the reduced 4-week consultation period was entirely proportionate in the circumstances.
- **Taken into account the product of the consultation.** Whilst no fundamental change was made to the airspace change proposal following consultation, the change sponsor demonstrated that they had taken consultee feedback into consideration by updating their Stage 4 documentation to provide clarity on circling approach and missed approach procedures.

PART D – Consultation Assessment Approval

	Name	Signature	Date
Consultation assessment completed by (Airspace Regulator – Engagement & Consultation)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	18/11/2019
Consultation assessment approved by (Manager Airspace Regulation)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	10/07/2020