

MINUTES OF BIGGIN HILL (FASI-S) ASSESSMENT MEETING HELD AT AVIATION HOUSE, GATWICK ON 24TH JANUARY 2019

7 February 2019

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Present		Appointment	Representing
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	BHAL
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	BHAL
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	BHAL (Osprey)
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	NATS
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	CAA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	CAA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	CAA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	CAA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	CAA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	CAA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	CAA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	CAA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	CAA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	CAA

CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

CAA confirmed that the Statement of Need was received in advance of the Assessment Meeting and confirmed that the documents would be published together with minutes of the meeting on the CAA portal. 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.

ITEM	ACTION
<p>Item 1 – Introduction.</p> <p>■ - Meeting opened with CAA welcoming all attendees and confirming CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement, following the receipt of a Biggin Hill Statement of Need. CAA reinforced the need to follow the CAP 1616 process requirements and that the meeting was an assessment of the requirements of the Statement of Need and not a Gateway.</p>	
<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need</p> <p>■ - Delivered the Biggin Hill Airport Statement of Need:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In a letter, dated 23rd June 2018, ■ set out the need for an Airspace Modernisation Program to facilitate the future needs of UK airspace users and asks for our 'commitment to the development and delivery of the Airspace Modernisation Program in the South East of the UK. 2. The airport currently serves a combination of Business and General Aviation aircraft types with 50,000 annual movements. Business Aviation presently accounts for around 17,000 annual movements but is expected to increase to circa 30,000 movements over the next 15 years because larger London airports are predicted to become increasingly congested with scheduled airline flights leaving no spare capacity for Business Aviation. Over the same period, General and Light aviation at LBHA is expected to decrease from 30,000 to less than 15,000 movements per annum as a result of air traffic control workload limitations and operational policy. It is not envisaged that the airport will support activities other than Business and General Aviation in the future. 3. In accordance with the request from DfT, Biggin Hill states the need to design and introduce new and/or revised departure and arrival routes that will fully and properly integrate with the new London Terminal Area architecture which will result from the Airspace Modernisation Program to which ■ refers. 	
<p>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change</p> <p>■ - Stated the opportunities and issues arising from the proposed change;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By working collaboratively with the other Airports in the South East of England (FASI-S), Biggin Hill Airport is able to ensure that we maintain safe and efficient access to the UK Airways which are currently undergoing a massive review and restructure. 2. All of the Biggin Hill Airport airways traffic is currently required to transit to and from Biggin Hill via waypoints to the East of the Airport. The restructuring of the London TMA provides opportunities for Biggin Air Traffic to arrive/depart via the South, West and North, providing more fuel, time and environmentally efficient routes. 3. Local Stakeholders might be affected; however, these effects can be minimised provided that Biggin Hill Airport is fully engaged in LAMP, which it is, as a member of the FASI-South Group. 4. Opportunities will flow from the 'indicative letterboxes' used for the 'exploratory' LTMA traffic flow & capacity models. 	
<p>Item 4 – Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified</p> <p>Already stated in Item 3.</p>	

<p>Item 5 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements</p> <p>■ - Confirmed that this ACP would be given a provisional Level 1 status as it impacted airspace below 7000ft.</p> <p>■ - The Portal on the Airspace Change website should retain an ACP Level “TBC” until a formal confirmation of the appropriate level had been received from the CAA, which would be at the end of Stage 2. The Sponsor should also add a geographic area to the Portal, as this information drives the postcode search functionality.</p> <p>■ - Would the limit of the Letter Boxes define the geographical area?</p> <p>■ - The position of the Letter Boxes might influence the geographic area. The geographic area drives the postcode search functionality. Some airports have illustrated the area by establishing a box or circle around the airport to facilitate easy Post Code search by Stakeholders.</p>	
<p>Item 6 – Provisional process timescales</p> <p>1. PT stated that the timescale would be in accordance with the agreed FASI- South Program Plan. This FASI-S Program Plan currently identified two provisional dates:</p> <p>1. DEFINE GATEWAY (STAGE 1) JULY 2019</p> <p>2. OPTIONS DEVELOPMENT AND ASSESSMENT (STAGE 2) JANUARY 2020</p> <p>■ - There is a discussion taking place with regards to extending the proposed schedule for Stage 2 of the FASI-S Program Plan to July 2020, which would incorporate Gateway 2B.</p> <p>■ - The ACP Process is flexible in that timelines can be re-negotiated with the CAA, if changes are required, from those initially promulgated.</p> <p>■ - There are likely to be 15 to 17 individual ACPs done over a 2 to 3-month period, would it be better to group ACPs to a more manageable workload?</p> <p>■ - Where a sponsor needs to change their time lines for whatever reasons, these will need to be re-negotiated and agreed with the CAA.</p> <p>■ - We will co-ordinate with the LAMP 2/FASI-S Group.</p> <p>■ - If we converge stage 2B at the network presentation, we can work with the CAA to create a strategy for ACP delivery. The onus will be on FASI-S to coordinate with the CAA. NATS NERL/ACOG/FASI-S will make proposals for a timescale.</p> <p>■ - Is there a risk of predetermination, when so many ACPs are being handled simultaneously?</p> <p>■ - Where a sponsor is unable to meet their target Gateway they will need to renegotiate their revised time line and gateways with the CAA and seek agreement. It should be remembered that each ACP within FASI(S) is an ACP in its own right and will be considered as such.</p> <p>■ - Each Airport required to go through individual ACPs, but at each stage there may be a failure to proceed. A strategy will be established on how to proceed.</p>	

<p>■ - The routes proposed by Biggin Hill traffic may present a better option than a route provided for other airports. How does the process differentiate between the various options?</p> <p>■ - Does it form part of the consultation?</p> <p>■ - The FASI(S) project and the sponsors thereof, will need to consider the cumulative impact of these changes on the population on the ground. Therefore, they will need to consider how their stakeholders will understand how they will be impacted.</p> <p>■ - We would ask the question, "Would you like Biggin Air Traffic to fly lower and other airport traffic to fly higher? Does this form part of the consultation process?</p> <p>■ - Use the consultation information as a pool of evidence for your decisions.</p> <p>■ - We have started negotiations, establishing NDAs with adjacent airfields, but nothing has been pre-determined until we get feedback from our consultees.</p> <p>■ – Stressed the importance of the sponsor recording evidence of engagement work undertaken in the early stages of the process. Engagement should be based on proposed Design Principles and evidence of this engagement will need to be presented as part of the Stage 1 Gateway submission.</p> <p>■ - Use the Options Appraisal to present the environmental effects. This would allow you to explain why Biggin Traffic rather than another airfields traffic.</p>	
<p>Item 7 – Next steps</p> <p>■ - Stated the next steps to be taken by Biggin Hill would be;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> DEVELOP DESIGN PRINCIPLES FOR DEFINE GATEWAY ASSESSMENT. CONDUCT IMPACT ASSESSMENTS OF PROPOSED DESIGN OPTIONS. DEVELOP DESIGN OPTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH DEFINED DESIGN PRINCIPLES. <p>■ - The Design Principles should be developed through the engagement with the Stakeholders.</p> <p>■ - This should be done at the representative level rather than to individual households.</p> <p>■ - Our Design Principles will be based on feedback from our Stakeholders which we consider are justifiable.</p> <p>■ - The CAA will be appointing account managers to ACPs in the future. Once these have been identified, the sponsor will be advised of their POC. In the meantime, ■■■■■ will be the POC for this ACP.</p> <p>■ - Will the Account Managers have a clutch of airfields?</p> <p>■ - Possibly not. It will depend on the expected workload. All Account Managers will manage the process but are not the subject matter experts for specific technical aspects of the ACP.</p>	
<p>Item 8 – Any other business</p> <p>■ – Explained that although it is not a mandatory CAP 1616 requirement change sponsors are encouraged to develop an Engagement Strategy to document how they will undertake this</p>	

activity throughout the whole airspace change process. This should help support the subsequent development of a standalone consultation strategy - something which CAP 1616 specifically requires the change sponsor to produce and submit to the CAA in Stage 3 of the process.

■■■ - This is something we are good at, as we have learnt from previous engagements, such as when we extended the airport operating hours. Considering; Why? When? How? What's in it for me? As detailed in CAP 1616 Appendix C.

■■■ - Do you intend to implement PBN Instrument Approach Procedures, in accordance with the three dates laid dates for the implementation of harmonised specifications and functionalities? You will need to co-ordinate a separate plan with the CAA to meet the 3 timelines.

■■■ - Yes. We currently have ACPs in progress for RNAV Approaches to both available runways at Biggin Hill.

■■■ - Category A and B procedures require LNAV/VNAV, Category C will need to integrate all RNAV Approaches, LNAV, LNAV/VNAV & LPV.

■■■ - We will advise the CAA of our intentions.

■■■ - What will you be looking to consult on? Our advice is that you look at attitudes towards various routes as per the CAP 1616 Appendix B. If you need to deviate from the process, please discuss this with us and we may be able to be flexible with certain requirements.

■■■ - Suggest early engagement on design assumptions with IFP Airspace Regulators regarding the Procedure Designs to ensure that there is no misunderstanding, which may slow progress, and may not allow them to be used in the final design. ■■■■

■■■ - Use the Point of Contact as much as possible, or ■■■■ for IFP aspects. They are there to assist and manage the process.

■■■ - Not Design Principles but Design Assumptions will be co-ordinated through a discussion in the FASI-S / LAMP meetings. Use of agreed Separation Standards and Navigation minimums could be provided in a co-ordinated approach.

■■■ - I agree. Technical assumptions and Navigation Standards could be provided by LAMP rather than individual Airports.

■■■ - There can be occasions when Design Criteria can be used in a different or non-standard way. Don't make assumptions that something can be used, just because it has been used before.

■■■ - Making use of collective assumptions will form a larger discussion within LAMP, to enable a collective presentation.

■■■ - There are two levels of engagement, General concepts level and Airport level. You need to ensure that you engage in both levels.

■■■ - Please provide the Slide Pack with the minutes. Could you explain your proposed North, West and South route opportunities mentioned on slide 4?

■■■ - Biggin IFR Traffic is all routed to and from Biggin from the East of the field. Routing to the North, South and West will provide more efficient options.

■■■ - Airports have been asked to produce a letterbox design which is completely conceptual. We understand that Biggin Hill is constrained by the location of other airports, we have asked for complete thinking, preparing different, non- standard and innovative routes.

■■■ - Today, we climb to the East and then progress en-route. With PBN, it is now possible to provide other routes. The question for NATS is how will it be achieved?

■■■ - We need to sell the efficient and effective systemisation, which will provide opportunities.

■■■ - Do we need to engage on the class of airspace, or is that implied? If we have procedural routes, there may be a knock-on effect if the aircraft departs from the route due to a TCAS event in Class G Airspace. As part of the ACP, should we consider Class E Airspace + Conspicuity?

■■■ - The design principles are the principles against which the sponsor wishes to apply when considering your design options.

■■■ - If it is considered later in the process that a change of airspace is sensible, but it is not in the Statement of Need, would such a request for airspace change be rejected?

■■■ - The Statement of Need sets down the requirement but not the solution.

■■■ - If we design routes, would you consider that Controlled Airspace was a good idea or not?

■■■ - Take your design principles to progress your design options and see if there is an opportunity to take it forward. Airspace change is not off the table.

■■■ - You will need to articulate this through the process.

■■■ - This has been a useful meeting. It is difficult when in the process and you find an element is blocked because it is not in the Statement of Need. The Design Principles consultation may present consideration for Controlled Airspace.

■■■ - Consider all options.

■■■ - As the holder of the budget, we have spent a considerable amount on interdependent ACPs. If one airport does not fully engage in the process, it may slow it down, which could cause a knock-on effect, with increased financial costs on the other airports. We find the LAMP Program Plan sensible and Biggin Hill intend to keep up with Gatwick and Heathrow, due to a dependency on airspace. Have any considerations been made to formalise delivery groups?

■■■ - The next FASI-S Technical Sub Group will be exploring the phasing of the ACP, providing Network and Airfield targets. The FASI-S Sub Group could be employed in establishing where Biggin Hill would like to sit.

■■■ - Would the CAA like to see this done? Delivery Groups?

■■■ - A timeline has to be agreed, we couldn't do it all at once. If you want to deliver a timeline, we will look at it.

■■■ - This will be discussed over time to achieve expected strategic timelines for airports based on feedback. This could be shared with the CAA.

■■■ - This project will cost Biggin Hill around £1 million, yet nobody consulted as to whether or not Biggin Hill was prepared to engage and spend the money.

■■■ - Consider Engagement versus Consultation. Only Stage 3 in the 1616 process requires consultation in line with Government requirements. Engagement is not required to pass the consultation test.

■■■ - A LAMP Point of Contact will be allocated to each airport group. Would it be useful to align the CAA Account Manager with the LAMP Point of Contact?

<p>■ - Yes. We can liaise on this matter.</p> <p>■ - Could you provide a full version of the minutes for the CAA and prepare a redacted version for the Portal.</p> <p>■ - Thanked the CAA for their help and advice and advised that Biggin Hill intended to push forward, in the correct format, at in a timely manner.</p> <p>■ - This is a structured process which is why it should assist us all.</p>	
---	--

ACTIONS ARISING FROM BIGGIN HILL LAMP 2 ASSESSMENT MEETING

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Minutes	■	Prepare minutes for distribution and Portal (Redacted version)	2 weeks
Timeline	■	To liaise with CAA regarding the Timeline	TBA
Delivery groups	■	To liaise with CAA regarding Delivery groups	TBA
Point of Contact	■	To advise CAA of point of contact established by NATS, to enable alignment with CAA Account Managers.	2 Months

Biggin Hill Airport
ACP Sponsor