

**MINUTES OF ACP-2020-007 ASSESSMENT MEETING 2 - HELD ON TEAMS PLATFORM ON
13/10/2020**

13/10/2020

Present	Appointment	Representing
[REDACTED]	Airspace Regulator – Airspace Utilisation	Civil Aviation Authority
[REDACTED]	Airspace Regulator – Engagement and Consultation	Civil Aviation Authority
[REDACTED]	Airspace Regulator – Environment	Civil Aviation Authority
[REDACTED]	Principal Airspace Regulator – Instrument Flight Procedures	Civil Aviation Authority
[REDACTED]	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	Civil Aviation Authority
[REDACTED]	Innovation Services Principal	Civil Aviation Authority
[REDACTED]	Head of UTM Research	Cranfield University
[REDACTED]	UAS Manager	Cranfield Airport

CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

Since this was the second assessment meeting for this ACP, the opening statement was not repeated. However, it is noted here (copied from Assessment 1 for ease of reference and completeness.

CAA noted that the following Statement of Need (submitted in the portal) and Presentation (circulated before the meeting) were received in advance of the Assessment Meeting and confirmed that the documents must be published by the sponsor, together with minutes of the meeting, on the Airspace Change portal page. CAA explained the purpose of the meeting and confirmed that the meeting was an Assessment Meeting and not a Gateway. The CAA reinforced that the sponsor was required to provide a broad description of their proposed approach to meeting the CAA’s CAP 1616 requirements, but the CAA was not deciding whether the proposed approach met the detailed requirements of the CAA’s process at this stage. The purpose of the Assessment Meeting (set out in detail in CAP 1616) was broadly:

- *for the Sponsor to present and discuss their Statement of Need,*
- *to enable the CAA to consider whether the proposal concerned falls within the scope of the formal airspace change process,*
- *to enable the CAA to consider the appropriate provisional Level to assign to the change proposal.*

Additionally, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to proceed to fulfil the requirements of the airspace change process and to provide information on timescales. Lastly, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to meet the engagement requirements of the various stage of the airspace change process.

	ACTION
Item 1 – Introduction	
A round-table was conducted to introduce all present attendees.	

<p>CAA will check review status of previous minutes and confirm if there are any outstanding comments before these are agreed (action 1). [REDACTED]</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note: CAA confirmed that only outstanding item is to correct ACP naming to ACP-2020-007. Cranfield to update document and upload to portal (action 1.1). [REDACTED]</i></p>	<p>CAA [REDACTED]</p> <p>Cranfield [REDACTED]</p>
<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</p> <p>[REDACTED] presented the statement of need (SON) using the presentation slides sent before the meeting. The NBEC consortium will conduct a number of BVLOS drone flight trials (segregated in the Airport ATZ, non-segregated within the ATZ, segregated in the entire corridor, and then non-segregated in the entire corridor) and a Temporary Danger Area (TDA) has been applied for specifically for the segregated in the entire corridor trial to provide enhanced mitigation to the trial activities.</p> <p>The planning assumption currently is that a TDA is the right path to enable airspace access and the trial to be conducted. The assumption will only be confirmed through the ACP process and once CAA is able to review all available and required documentation. CAA will only be able to agree that a TDA is appropriate for this application through the ACP process.</p> <p>[REDACTED] mentioned that Cranfield Airport will have to provide evidence of how they safeguard Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs) into the Airfield, where applicable (e.g. ILS and RNAV approaches). TDA beneath routes will not impact them. AW assured that since the sponsor is effectively the airport itself, this is already being considered and Airport is assessing impact on its IFPs. Any questions should be directed to CAA IFP team.</p>	
<p>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement</p> <p>AW informed that Cranfield Airport has already started stakeholder engagement activities using CAP1900 guidelines for the NBEC corridor and general UAS trials activities, currently mainly with local councils.</p> <p>[REDACTED] informed that at submission stage, a report must be submitted to the CAA to demonstrate that targeted engagement with relevant aviation stakeholders on operational viability/safety has been conducted. There exists a specific list of aviation stakeholders (the NATMAC list) that can be used to assist with identification of stakeholders and three entries on the list were highlighted; the General Aviation Alliance and Airspace4All from a General Aviation perspective and the MoD DAATM. There is no requirement to submit an engagement plan to the CAA in advance of the targeted engagement activities, but Cranfield may do so if they wish. Drawing up a plan is good practice and should include the timeline for the targeted engagement piece. The recommended period is of 6 weeks and thus if it is less, a rationale should be included to justify this. The final report and the engagement evidence therein should include an explanation of how Cranfield engaged and chose stakeholders (relevant specific aviation stakeholders), the</p>	

<p>methodology used (e.g, emails, meeting, feedback form) and why it was selected. The report should include an analysis of feedback from stakeholders and how that influenced final proposal.</p> <p>The change sponsor is also required to produce the raw data evidence (e.g. all the emails, minutes from meetings, slide packs or notes from forums etc.) that have been used throughout (e.g. responses, to clarify information etc). These should consider GDPR regulations. Once the proposal has been submitted to the CAA, redacted versions should be uploaded to the portal.</p> <p>It was suggested that stakeholders are informed from the outset on the overall / future NBEC aspirations (i.e. having routine BVLOS operations throughout corridor). This will assist with transparency and ensure that engagement provides more informed and future proofed feedback.</p> <p>Finally, the report should describe how Cranfield plans to deal with complaints (incl. collect, monitor and report on) and how Cranfield expect to handle those. It is advisable to build on existing procedures and processes. However, a process specific to the TDA should be devised and implemented, and can be included in the TDA engagement plan if drawn up. The level and contents of complaints should be reported to the CAA once the TDA has been implemented and throughout its operation.</p> <p>█ stressed that throughout stakeholder engagement, Cranfield will need to speak to CAA UAS sector team before submitting final TDA designs and undertaking the operation, as the UAS Sector Team will be required to approve the operational safety case and approve the associated buffers (UAS vs TDA not TDA vs Controlled Airspace). This is particularly important for matters such as detect and avoid (DAA) capability, that needs to be signed by UAS team for routine BVLOS operations. This approach would to ensure timescales are realistic. █ informed that UAS team have been fully engaged to-date and that they are fully aware of aspirations, of the test and review planning (incl. fight trials approach). It was agreed that the UAS team would need to provide their own approvals.</p> <p>Environment Engagement</p> <p>█ informed that from the environment perspective there is no specific engagement required for TDA. However, it was recommended that some degree of information for stakeholders' engagement would be useful, e.g. indication of noise, since drones <20kg are very novel in the airspace usage context.</p> <p>█ specified that current plans for drone usage are in the range of 8-10kg with 1,5m wingspan and flying at <400ft, i.e. small, light and very quiet. However, as Cranfield University are installing noise and acoustic sensors across the campus, arrangements could be made to capture noise and acoustic measurements to inform other areas, such as public acceptance and stakeholder engagement activities. CAA agreed that this would be of interest to them and the wider industry as well.</p>	
<p>Item 4 – Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement</p> <p>█ suggested that █ is put into contact with Cranfield Head of Comms to help throughout process and to ensure that the requirements and framework are understood and captured in the Cranfield consultation plan (action 2). This will ensure that Cranfield wider consultation process is leveraged in terms of the TDA-specific engagement required.</p>	<p>Cranfield █</p>

<p>Environment Engagement █████ to investigate opportunities to capture noise and acoustic measurements from drone flight trials (action 3).</p>	<p>Cranfield █████</p>
<p>Item 5 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements*</p> <p>A TDA application means that the proposal goes from Stage 1 to Stage 4 directly, after publication and agreement of Assessment meeting minutes.</p> <p><i>* When the sponsor submits their gateway materials for each Gateway at the agreed submission deadline, the period between this and the gateway decision will be an analysis by the CAA Airspace Regulatory team (Airspace Regulation) of the documentation submitted, for the purposes of making a recommendation to the CAA Gateway decision maker(s). In conducting the gateway assessment, the CAA is assessing the process employed and its compliance with the guidance stipulated within CAP1616. It is not an assessment of the merits of the submission itself, which is reviewed at Stage 5 - Decision. We may request, documentation from the sponsor that is referred to in the gateway submission but has not been provided as part of the Gateway submission materials. We may also request the sponsor to provide information by way of clarification relating to statements or assumptions made in the submission. Any further information sought by Airspace Regulation at this stage is for clarificatory purposes and is only for determining compliance with the CAP 1616 process.</i></p> <p><i>In any instance where a sponsor has not met the requirements of the process, we will inform them after the gateway decision and advise of next steps.</i></p>	
<p>Item 6 – Provisional process timescales*</p> <p>█████ went through the suggested project timescales.</p> <p>Working back from the need to have a TDA in July-Aug 2021 for a TDA and based on existing AIRAC 2020 timescales (understanding that these will be revised for 2021):</p> <p>01 July-30 August 2021: TDA to be in place. It is anticipated that there will be a number of 5-days trials within that period.</p> <p>21 May 2021: Deadline for CAA to submit TDA details to NATS AIS (i.e. 27days earlier than publication dates).</p> <p>March/April 2021: Evidence of Engagement together with final details of TDA to be submitted on portal (i.e. 28 days decision period before submission from CAA to NATS).</p> <p>21 November 2020: Details of TDA to be submitted to portal (incl. Full coordinates and altitudes etc – accurately and checked), so that CAA has at least 6 months to review application (see pages 87-90 of DAP1916 for details).</p> <p>Note these dates will have to be reviewed and ratified once NATS publish the update AIRAC dates for 2021, expected in early December.</p> <p><i>* The timeline agreed may become subject to change by the CAA. This is because the Secretary of State for Transport has directed the CAA to prioritise GNSS applications and this may have an impact on your ACP if we need to direct resource accordingly.</i></p>	
<p>Item 7 – Next steps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Cranfield to confirm timescales and formal view on plan, including consultation activities and responses / feedback / support expected from CAA, for them to check that these are achievable (action 4). 2) Monthly update call to be setup with CAA ██████ to track progress (action 5). 	<p>Cranfield █████</p> <p>Cranfield █████</p>

Item 8 – Any other business	
N/A	

ACTIONS ARISING FROM NBEC ASSESSMENT MEETING

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Action 1	■	CAA to check review status of previous minutes and confirm if there are any outstanding comments before these are agreed	19/10/20
Action 1.1	■	Cranfield to update Assessment Minutes 1 document and upload to portal	26/10/20
Action 2	■	Cranfield suggested that CAA Regulator – Engagement and Consultation is put into contact with Cranfield Head of Comms to help throughout targeted engagement process.	30/10/20
Action 3	■	Cranfield to investigate opportunities to capture noise and acoustic measurements from drone flight trials	30/12/20
Action 4	■	Cranfield to confirm timescales and formal view on plan, including consultation activities and responses / feedback / support expected from CAA, for them to check that these are achievable	20/11/20
Action 5	■	Cranfield to set up monthly progress call with CAA to track progress	26/10/20

Cranfield Airport
ACP Sponsor