

**MINUTES OF PERMANENT INCLUSION OF REDUCED DISTANCE PROCEDURES INTO AIP
ASSESSMENT MEETING HELD ON TEAMS ON 19th AUGUST 2022**

Present	Appointment	Representing
[REDACTED]	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	Principal Airspace Regulator	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (IFP)	CAA
	Aerodrome Inspector	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	Operations Director	STAL
	Airfield Operations Integration Mgr	STAL
	Head of Operations	STAL
Apologies		
[REDACTED]	Inspector ATS (operations)	CAA
	Flight Evaluation Unit Manager	STAL

	ACTION
<p>Item 1 – Introduction</p> <p>Introductions were undertaken and [REDACTED] read out the following statement regarding the requirements and expectations of the meeting;</p> <p><i>The CAA has received the Statement of Need in advance of this Assessment Meeting and can confirm that the documents are required to be published together with the minutes of this meeting on the Airspace Change Portal.</i></p> <p><i>‘It must be noted that this is an Assessment Meeting and not a Gateway. The Change Sponsor is required to provide a broad description of their proposed approach to meeting the CAA’s CAP 1616 requirements however the CAA will not at this stage decide whether it meets the detailed requirements of the CAA’s process.</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of the Assessment Meeting as set out in CAP1616 is for the Sponsor to present and discuss their Statement of Need, to enable the CAA to consider whether the proposal falls within the scope of the formal airspace change process and to enable the CAA to consider the appropriate provisional Level to assign the change proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, the Sponsor is required to provide information on how it intends to fulfil the requirements of the Airspace Change Process and it’s provisional timescales.</i></p> <p><i>Lastly, the Sponsor is required to provide information on how it intends to meet the engagement requirements of the various stages of the Airspace Change Process.’</i></p>	
<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</p> <p>[REDACTED] gave a presentation on the Statement of Need to the group on the core drivers for proposal to place the Stansted reduced distance maintenance operation data within the AIP.</p>	

<p>████ outlined that one of the drivers for the change was following the AAIB report into SmartLynx incident where the crew had the incorrect flight data for an approach to Stansted. The CAA stated that they were aware of the AAIB report and the recommendations.</p> <p>████ questioned what data exactly would be placed within the AIP. Should or would it include the plates, charts, coding tables or text as well.</p> <p>████ advised that there had been regular ongoing discussions with █████ and █████ of the CAA and they had agreed to ensure the charts and coding data was included to address AAIB report concerns and include the rest of the data/text in a Supplement. It was stated that whilst full inclusion had been the original aim, this hybrid solution was up for consideration if required by the group.</p> <p>████ asked which other airports had similar approach/runway data listed in the AIP. █████ advised that Gatwick's AIP entry on use of their standby runway provided the template for STAL to follow. █████ also stated that Lydd airport had a similar data regarding a runway approach entry within the AIP. It was noted that Gatwick runway not similar as it is a different configuration to the Stansted reduced runway. This was accepted but the principal of permanence is the point which is the driver for inclusion.</p>	
<p>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change</p> <p>████ stated that she was not sure this was a permanent procedure and therefore did not need to be placed within the AIP.</p> <p>████ stated that the procedure is permanent and had been used periodically for over the last 18 years as required. Permanent AGL software and hardware had been installed at Stansted to enable this use of this procedure such as PAPI and threshold lights was always the same. █████ stated that it did sound permanent if physical hardware had been installed to accommodate the procedure.</p> <p>████ advised that an AIP entry would help with ensuring IFP safeguarding requirements of these displaced threshold approaches would be met and aligned with current approaches. It was stated that there was no change to the missed approach.</p>	
<p>Item 4 – Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified</p> <p>Nothing was noted at the time.</p>	

<p>Item 5 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements</p> <p>█████ stated that they were not certain what level of ACP this proposed change would need to be and further consultation with CAA colleagues with be required.</p>	
<p>Item 6 – Provisional process timescales</p> <p>Nothing was noted at the time.</p>	
<p>Item 7 – Next steps</p> <p>█████ stated that they were not certain what level of ACP this proposed change would need to be and further consultation with CAA colleagues with be required.</p>	
<p>Item 8 – Any other business</p> <p>Nothing was noted at the time.</p>	

ACTIONS ARISING FROM PERMANENT INCLUSION OF REDUCED DISTANCE PROCEDURES INTO AIP ASSESSMENT MEETING

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
ACP Scale	████	Decision on what level of ACP this proposed change would need to be and further consultation with CAA colleagues with be required.	

████
ACP Sponsor

Post Meeting Note:

Further to the meeting █████ contacted █████ to confirm that following consultation with CAA colleagues, it was agreed the matter did fall within the scope of the ACP process and would be considered as a Level 0 change. It was further agreed that just the approach charts to the displaced thresholds and associated coding table data would be included within the AIP data with the rest of the information published in a SUP when works were planned.