



Ministry
of Defence

ACP-2020-092

**GATEWAY DOCUMENTATION:
STAGE 2 DEVELOP AND ASSESS**

STEP 2A ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Engagement Methodology

The aim of this document is to outline the engagement methodology the Sponsor used in seeking feedback on the Design Options. This methodology was created because of feedback from the CAA after the Define Gateway, CAP 1616 and previous engagements with stakeholders during Stage 1 of this ACP.

The sponsor deemed a 4-week engagement period was proportional to the feedback sought at this stage, with extra time offered to all stakeholders if they required it. The guiding principle was CAP 1616, which highlights that the CAA must consider whether the Sponsor has 'ensured, as far as possible, that stakeholders are satisfied that the design options are aligned with the design principles and sponsors to set out how decisions they have taken relate to stakeholder feedback.

The engagement methodology was as follows:

Stakeholder identification. Feedback was requested from all stakeholders identified at Stage 1, including:

- NATMAC list
- MOD stakeholders
- Other ACP Change Sponsors

Engagement Methods. To generate the required engagement within the timeline the sponsor employed the following methods:

- **Email.** An initial email was sent out, detailing the process, how to provide feedback and the timelines.
- In the attached 'Options Development' document, a **Templated feedback form** was added to it.
- **One to one discussions** were offered for all stakeholders, though no one requested this.

Stakeholder feedback

Targeted engagement took place between the sponsor and those stakeholders affected by this proposal. As we have used this airspace for many years, we had a strong understanding of who is likely to be effected but decided to cast the net further to ensure every stakeholder was informed and had an opportunity to comment. The stakeholders are listed below:

Aviation Stakeholders - Internal		
1 Gp ISTAR	2 Gp	11 Gp A7
19 Sqn	78 Sqn	DAATM
DAAM	Navy FGEN	Navy Command HQ

Aviation Stakeholders - External		
Airlines UK	Airspace4All	Airport Operators Association
Airfield Operators Group	Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association	Airspace Change Organising Group
Association of Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems UK	Aviation Environment Federation	British Airways
BAe Systems	British Airline Pilots Association	British Balloon and Airship Club
British Business and General Aviation Association	British Gliding Association	British Helicopter Association
British Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association	British Microlight Aircraft Association	General Aviation Safety Council
British Model Flying Association	British Skydiving	Drone Major
General Aviation Alliance	Guild of Air Traffic Control Officers	Honourable Company of Air Pilots
Helicopter Club of Great Britain	Heavy Airlines	Iprosurv
Isle of Man CAA	Light Aircraft Association	Low Fare Airlines
Military Aviation Authority	NATS	PPL/IR (Europe)
QuientiQ	United States Air Force Europe	

Feedback Summary

It was unsurprising that the two stakeholders who this change would likely affect the most; MoD and NATS, offered the most feedback. The MoD overwhelmingly supported the proposal. NATS had concerns about the airspace meeting ASM and FUA and requested more information on how the Change Sponsor was going to do that and a LOA to be drafted to ensure impact to the network was minimised. They also had concerns about the

safety and integrity of the airspace, requesting a safety case and pointing out the airspace will require an FBZ. Details of all stakeholder engagement can be found in the 'Engagement Evidence' documents, also in this submission.