

**MINUTES OF THE PENZANCE & TRESCO HELIPORTS PINS APPROACHES ASSESSMENT MEETING
HELD ONLINE ON 30TH MARCH 2021**

30/3/21 (Virtual Teams)

CAA Case Officer
CAA Portal
Sponsor

Present	Appointment	Representing
 (Case Officer)	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	ATS Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	IFP Regulation	CAA
	Principal IFP Regulator	CAA
	Flight Ops (H)	CAA
	Flight Ops (H)	CAA
	Engagement & Consultation Regulator	CAA
	Managing Director	Sloane Helicopters
	Chief pilot	Sloane Helicopters
	Heliport Manager	Tresco Heliport
	Merlin Aerospace Consulting	Consultant

CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

CAA noted that the Agenda, Statement of Need and Supporting presentation 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, including determining whether the proposal falls within the scope of a scaled CAP 1616 ACP for the introduction of RNP Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) without an Approach Control as described in CAP 1961,
- 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 stages of the airspace change process.

	ACTION
<p>Item 1 – Introduction</p> <p>CAA opened the meeting, led the round-table introductions and the Agenda was agreed.</p> <p>Sloane Helicopters briefed, using a PowerPoint slide deck, that this project started in July 2017 [ACP-2017-044 refers]. This was superseded in 2019 [ACP-2019-065] and a further ACP was added in 2020 [ACP-2020-022 refers]</p> <p>The latter two applications, covering the Trial and the PINS approaches, had to be paused due to the Covid-19 pandemic. During this time, the Secretary of State's wishes regarding approaches without approach control became known so on receiving CAP1961 it was clear</p>	

<p>to the Sponsor that the requirements could met and the Statement of Need was updated to initiate a Scaled CAP 1616 Airspace Change as detailed in CAP 1961. A revised Statement of Need was submitted on a new Form DAP1916 and ACP-2021-013 issued.</p> <p>Sloane's MD gave a description of the breadth of his company's operations across the UK and Ireland including Helimed services, charter, training and maintenance. The air service to Isles of Scilly being their latest venture.</p> <p>Sloane's Chief Pilot gave an overview of the capabilities of their modern fleet including the 109 and 139 equipment to be employed servicing these routes.</p> <p>Tresco Heliport's manager gave a history of the heliports and recent CAA relicensing.</p>	
<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</p> <p>Sloane Helicopters presented the revised Statement of Need (SoN) for the implementation of an RNP Helicopter Departures and Instrument Approaches at Penzance and Tresco Heliports including an IFR Transition and provided additional background information about the heliports and their operations.</p> <p>The revised Statement of Need was submitted in February 2021 superseding any contained in previous ACPs 2017-44, 2019-065 and 2020-022. For the benefit of attendees who were new to the project it was read out in full.</p> <p>The main points from the presentation supporting the SoN were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AW139 of Penzance Helicopters supported by AW109SP back up will be the primary users of the proposed RNP Procedures. • The intention is to use standard designs and the IAP concepts prepared in 2017 by an APDO were presented. • In accordance with CAP 1961 constraints: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The concept proposal does not change the final approach path of aircraft to the TLOF within 1nm from the FATO end, and ○ The concept proposal will not change the environmental impact of aircraft utilising other aerodromes. • During the previous CAP 1616 Stage 1 activity, Sloane Helicopters engaged with Aeronautical stakeholders so lines of communication exist already. NATMAC will be added to the target list. <p>Case Officer described process requirements as they relate to CAP1616 Part 1c and then the Trial Elements. He went on to say the Trial in parallel would have to be conducted under CAP1616 Part 1b. However, it was felt that the Conops were not quite ready. He asked what the Sponsor had in mind.</p> <p>The Chief pilots' response was that Sloane's wished to operate in IMC with passengers onboard whilst ACP proceeds. He understood from previous meetings a trial was achievable. So, what is needed is guidance on how to we get into trial? What do we need to do to satisfy the requirements of a trail as described in CAP1616 ?</p> <p>CAA Case Officer responded that for that to happen the Sponsor would have to un-pause the ACP that covers the trial and follow the trial process in CAP1616 for elements such as engagement, environment and IFP design approval. A discussion followed about details such as the Flight Validation Plan and who would fly it in what equipment and how to check it was it for purpose. There would be a need to collect data either from a GPS logger or Sky Demon.</p> <p>Chief Pilot stated that a previous Flight Validation had used a datalogger called Platero provided by the Approved Procedure Design Organisation and asked if this was sufficient. The IFP Regulator replied that it was unlikely as the procedures were changing but was willing to consider the data.</p>	

<p>Sloane's MD asked for clarification whether another helicopter other than the one for passenger services could be used?</p> <p>IFP regulator confirmed so long as the database was the same a backup a/c would be acceptable. Although a simulator may also be acceptable it was unlikely to contain the Heliports in the systems.</p> <p>Airspace Regulator (Technical) asked when one compared the difference of a Part 1B trial by unpausing that ACP and conducting a FV, what will the Sponsor gain? If you prove FV then what are you achieving as the trial has to be innovative?</p> <p>Chief Pilot's response was at the first meeting a few years ago we came out with two requirements. One was to have an ACP and the other the Trial which had been a suggestion from CAA being a quicker way than the 2-year CAP1616 process. The procedures are needed as soon as possible due limit of having a Heliport but be unable to break cloud over bay which leads to delay and disruption. The need for airspace change is understood for procedures to be published in the AIP but this is an operational change.</p> <p>Airspace Regulator (Technical) agreed that looking back it was right then but now there is CAP1961 and Part 1b. He pointed out that reading CAP1616 paragraphs 312 to 316, what is the purpose of the trial now? Suggested getting through CAP1961 with a FV may not require parallel workstreams continuing.</p> <p>The Sponsor pointed out that accelerating the process and cutting down the timeline even by 2 or 3 months we could be faced operating without IFR throughout the summer and into early autumn leading to delay and disruption to public services for several months.</p> <p>Airspace Regulator (Technical) advised exercising caution as the trial back then wasn't actually agreed. A trial can't be used to circumvent an ACP so must be justified and it will up to Sloane's to do that.</p> <p>Sponsor suggested that having the IAPs Flight Validated would use an experimental data card exclusively for the a/c. This would allow the sponsor to gather operational data and only place the procedures into the AIP at the end of the process. There would be no public visibility of the approaches and once in the UK AIP be restricted to PPR for company a/c only.</p> <p>Principal IFP Regulator reminded meeting that IFP requirements remain the same for approvals under CAP1616 and 1961. There is no benefit from conducting a trial under CAP1961. The context between 2017 and now is different due to scaling. The PINS policy will be attached to CAP1616 and CAP1961, is now incorporated into CAP1616 as Part 1c, taking care how we implement in the UK.</p> <p>[CAA Post Meeting Note: After further discussions with the Sponsor to ascertain the reasons and detail for any proposed trial, it was decided that a trial is not appropriate for this ACP, could not occur with passengers and the airspace change should continue under the permanent route through a CAP1616 Part 1c process with previous ACPs being withdrawn.]</p>	
<p>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change</p> <p>Since the previous meeting in March 2020 the Covid-19 pandemic had caused the process to be stalled.</p> <p>At that meeting discussions around a trial running in parallel with the ACP had been examined.</p>	

<p>Item 4 – Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified</p> <p>In view of the work already undertaken with regards to identifying opportunities and issues and the scalability under CAP1961 (CAP1616 Part 1c), Sloane Helicopters has a solution in mind comprising RNP Helicopter Departures, PINS Approaches and an IFR RNP-1 Transition. Therefore, this has been accomplished.</p>	
<p>Item 5 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements</p> <p>The CAA Case Officer stated that the provisional level for the ACP would be Level 1. The level would be confirmed at the end of Stage 2 of the CAP 1616 (Part 1c) Process.</p> <p>It was also confirmed that the ACP appears to meet the requirements to follow the CAP1961 Scaled process, which is now Part 1c of CAP1616.</p>	
<p>Item 6 – Provisional process timescales*</p> <p>The CAA Case Officer explained that, for this scaled process (CAP1616 Part 1c), the Options Appraisal and Environmental aspects were still required to be considered but not to the extent of a full scale Level 1 ACP.</p> <p>The CAA Engagement & Consultation Regulator reminded the Sponsor that for Engagement Stage 2 engagement is required with an APDO and then once the CAA has approved the Safety Questionnaire engagement is required with affected stakeholders. For Stage 3 an engagement strategy and materials must be submitted to the CAA for approval in advance of the engagement activity. The strategy should include details of the identified stakeholders with reasoning for choices made, engagement methodology, materials to be used and timescale with rationale. At Stage 4 the CAA will expect to see an engagement summary report including full analysis of stakeholder feedback received and how it has affected the final proposal (if that is the case) together with raw data to support the submission including emails etc. In terms of the length of time 6 weeks can be the starting point as this is in line with other scaled processes. Full reasoning should be given for the length of engagement chosen.</p> <p>ATS Regulator (Technical) commented that the ATM Questionnaire has to be completed first before the Sponsor can progress. The ATS environment fairly complicated due to other activities and the Sponsor should also consider the Navy. He drew attention to the fact that CAP413 about to be issued which will include appropriate phraseology. Although there are existing LOAs in place the inclusion of IFR operations will add complications.</p> <p>The CAA's representative from Flight Ops (Helicopters) asked the sponsor to take note of PBN105 UK965/2012 SPA requirements and the template flight ops will use to assess the application.</p> <p>CAA Case Officer spoke for the Economic Regulator who was not at the meeting. He reminded the Sponsor to include the two important design principles included in CAP1961 that -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proposal should maintain a high level of safety, and • The Proposal should avoid overflight of densely populated areas where possible. <p>From the Airspace Regulator (Environment) the CAA Case Officer relayed that although exempted the Sponsor should still consider relevant impacts to allow stakeholders to understand the change. He highlighted that although the amended October 2019 Air Navigation Directions identify that the full environmental objectives set out in the Air Navigation Guidance 2017 do not apply to proposals for Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) Without an Approach Control Service (WAC), the directions still <i>"...expect sponsors of exempted proposals....to consider the potential environmental consequences of such proposals, and to engage with relevant communities as the CAA considers appropriate."</i></p>	<p>Sponsor</p>

<p>It was therefore identified that the Sponsor should undertake a qualitative assessment and as a minimum this assessment should include information on the anticipated change in the number of aircraft using the aerodrome; the change in the type of aircraft using the aerodrome; changes to the altitude of aircraft using the procedure and the change to areas overflowed by the introduction of the IAPs. It was suggested that the sponsor may find it helpful to achieve some of these requirements by following a similar format to the qualitative environmental assessment requirements set out for a 90 day to 12 month trial in CAP1616 B88 and by producing high-level operational diagrams which look at areas overflowed and how that might differ before and after the change.</p> <p>However, as per CAP1616 356 no further environmental assessment will be necessary if the sponsor can demonstrate the change will not increase movements by more than 10%; the proposal does not change the final approach path of aircraft to the runway within 1nm from the runway end; and, the proposal will not change the environmental impact of aircraft utilising other aerodromes.</p> <p>The Sponsor responded by confirming that Radar 360 had been engaged to provide data logging capability to capture ADS-B and 1090mHz signals from traffic in the vicinity.</p> <p>The Principal IFP Regulator added to the discussion about timelines. He explained his IFP Regulators must check workload before committing. He reminded the meeting that as the UK will not have access to EGNOS after June 2021 there will be no LPV minima available.</p> <p>The initial estimated timeline for the project is proposed in the following table:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="245 929 1158 1424"> <tr> <td>Publish Minutes and Timeline</td><td>16 April 2021</td></tr> <tr> <td>Submit IFP Designs for approval</td><td>23 April 2021</td></tr> <tr> <td>Complete ATM Questions</td><td>30 April 2021</td></tr> <tr> <td>Publish Stage 2 on Portal</td><td>30 June 2021</td></tr> <tr> <td>Start Engagement S3</td><td>26 July 2021</td></tr> <tr> <td>Submission of Proposals S4</td><td>31 August 2021</td></tr> <tr> <td>Target AIRAC</td><td>Submission 17 December 2021 Effective 24 March 2022</td></tr> </table> <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 RNP Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) without an Approach Control proposal; this may impact Airspace Regulation resource and consequently timelines.</i></p>	Publish Minutes and Timeline	16 April 2021	Submit IFP Designs for approval	23 April 2021	Complete ATM Questions	30 April 2021	Publish Stage 2 on Portal	30 June 2021	Start Engagement S3	26 July 2021	Submission of Proposals S4	31 August 2021	Target AIRAC	Submission 17 December 2021 Effective 24 March 2022	
Publish Minutes and Timeline	16 April 2021														
Submit IFP Designs for approval	23 April 2021														
Complete ATM Questions	30 April 2021														
Publish Stage 2 on Portal	30 June 2021														
Start Engagement S3	26 July 2021														
Submission of Proposals S4	31 August 2021														
Target AIRAC	Submission 17 December 2021 Effective 24 March 2022														
<p>Item 7 – Next steps</p> <p>It was agreed that the Sponsor will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> produce the Assessment Meeting minutes to be reviewed by CAA and then uploaded on the Portal by the Sponsor within 2 weeks. (i.e. by 16th April 2021) Provide updated timescales for the Project. Complete and submit a response for both Penzance and Tresco to the ATM Questionnaire. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noting that ATM Safety Questionnaire needs to be reviewed by the CAA before exiting Stage 2. <p>[CAA Post Meeting Note: Following further discussions, the Sponsor agreed the next actions:]</p>	<p>Sponsor</p>														

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Revise the Statement of Need to reflect discussions about previous ACPs, removing the intent to apply for a trial.</i> • <i>Revise the timeline to allow sufficient regulatory process</i> • <i>Post redacted versions of required documents on the Airspace Portal</i> • <i>Withdraw permanently the 2 paused ACPs, and</i> • <i>On receipt of the forms for DfT funding complete and return to CAA]</i> 	
<p>Item 8 – Any other business</p> <p>Sloane Helicopters enquired if the CAA Facilitation Team would be available to support the application. CAA confirmed it expected that to be the case but clarification should be sort from the Team Leader</p> <p>CAA Airspace Regulator (Technical) reminded the meeting that although Gateways are not specified the CAA will require reasonable time to consider and review any submissions at each Stage.</p> <p>Meeting closed at 16.12</p>	Sponsor

ACTIONS ARISING FROM PENZANCE & TRESCO HELIPORTS PINS APPROACHES ASSESSMENT MEETING

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Minutes of meeting	Sloane	Prepare minutes for CAA review and post to Portal	16/4/21
Proposed timescale	CAA	Review proposals and comment	16/4/21
ATM Questionnaire	Sloane	Complete and submit both to CAA for review	30/4/21

[REDACTED] on behalf of Sloane Helicopters
 ACP Sponsor