

**MINUTES OF ACP-2022-024, ELECTRONIC CONSPICUITY MANDATED ZONE, ASSESSMENT MEETING
HELD ONLINE VIA TEAMS ON FRIDAY 22ND JULY**

07 September 2022

Distribution List:

CAA
Airspace Change Portal

Present	Appointment	Representing
██████████	Airspace & Sustainability Lead	ANSL
██████████████████	Head of Innovation & ATM Solutions	ANSL
██████████	Head of Technology	Skyports
██████████████	Chief Regulatory Officer	Skyports
██████████	Regulatory Affairs Associate	Skyports
██████████████	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
██████████	Airspace Regulator (Engagement & Consultation)	CAA
██████████	ATS Inspector for Edinburgh Airport	CAA

CAA Assessment Meeting (Airspace Trial) Opening Statement

CAA noted that the Agenda and Statement of Need 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. The CAA reinforced that the sponsor was required to provide a broad description of their proposed approach to meeting the CAA’s CAP 1616 Airspace Trial 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.

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 airspace change process.

	ACTION
<p>Item 1 – Introduction</p> <p>The CAA gave apologies for their Airspace Regulator (Environmental) who could not be present at the meeting. The Airspace Regulator (Environmental), on reviewing the Statement of Need, prepared a written statement for the Change Sponsor which is set out further on in these notes. (See Item 4 below). The consortium (ANSL & Skyports) presented a deck of slides which followed the above agenda. These slides will be uploaded to the Airspace Change Portal.</p> <p>The Change sponsor confirmed that the consortium had been onboarded into the CAA Regulatory Sandbox in June 2022 with this project.</p>	

<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</p>	
<p>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change</p> <p>The change sponsor presented the slide deck to CAA and discussions arose at slide 9 concerning technology. CAA asked the consortium ‘what technology are airspace users expected to use?’. Skyports replied that it is Electronic Conspicuity (EC) devices specified in CAP1391 , although it is expected that we will be able to see all other devices, for instance PilotAware. Because a ground sensor network has been established, and the change sponsor will have surveillance picture through Unmanned Traffic Management (UTM), they will be able to see Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) position to see if operators are compliant with their flight plan. Change sponsor will be able to implement flight restrictions.</p> <p>CAA also asked if NATS will see aircraft on their radars at this low level and could it cause clutter? The consortium replied that they couldn’t answer for NATS, however anecdotal evidence suggests that NATS can’t see very low level. It was offered that rather than being a clutter ‘problem’, the Electronic Conspicuity (EC) would be an addition for all stakeholders to enhance situational awareness.</p> <p>CAA asked whether the consortium were referring to aviation media or local media, and encouraged the consortium to engage with the media as widely as possible.</p>	
<p>Item 4 – Process requirements</p> <p>Skyports reassured CAA that the engagement work would not pre-determine the outcome of the ACP.</p> <p>At slide 16, there was a group discussion on the requirement for noise assessment of drones for this ACP. It was at this point that CAA shared their Airspace Regulator (Environmental Regulator)’s written statement. Presented below:</p> <p><i>“Airspace Regulator (Environmental)) statement is as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Page 174 of CAP1616, specifically Para B88 which outlines the assessment criteria for a trial that is longer than 90 days but shorter than 12 months. The sponsor should be made aware that this assessment applies to their own traffic, in addition to any other traffic impacted as a consequence of the change. As this ACP concerns UAS, due to their tonal nature, the sponsor will be required to apply a 10dB noise penalty to any noise levels reported. Should the sponsor believe that a quantitative assessment using the metrics identified by the CAA will result in no difference in the outputs for a particular metric then a qualitative assessment may be used instead; however, in such circumstance the sponsor must present it’s rationale to the CAA to justify this (CAP1616 Para B26 provides further information). When the airspace design has matured, prior to engaging with stakeholders, the sponsor should contact the CAA so that the environmental assessment requirements can be agreed.”</i></p>	

<p>Skyports stated that last summer the CAA completed an analysis of the noise of their drone so CAA has that data.</p> <p>The consortium thanked the CAA for the statement and agreed to take this away and discuss further. Ultimately, to incorporate the feedback into ongoing trial planning.</p> <p>Further feedback from the CAA's Engagement & Consultation Regulator was shared and discussed and the consortium thanked the CAA and acknowledged points made. The consortium will incorporate this feedback and would like to take the CAA up on their offer to review the ACP stakeholder list.</p> <p>CAA confirmed not consultation but engagement but be clear on the difference. Give consideration to other Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) operators and space operators in the proposed area of operation. In terms of engagement, it is important to separate the key blocks of engagement as there are three specific formal blocks, one prior, which forms the plan, formal engagement prior to implementation and, with the communities, broaden engagement to communities (which isn't a requirement, but we may wish to consider doing this). Process is very similar to temporary airspace changes.</p> <p>CAA asked if the timescales are dependent on the proposed proving operations in the Edinburgh Airport Control Zone that the consortium are proposing later this year (but not part of the ACP). The consortium will be testing the technology, but it is not dependent on the ACP, as the trial is unique to the particular area proposed for the ACP.</p> <p>CAA provided some observations. When doing engagement, it is useful to include traffic numbers, e.g. Remote Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS) envisaged to be using the area daily and likely flight paths. The CAA was keen to better understand the size of the drone being used and this will be relevant to understand the impacts. The consortium understood that this is important in the proposal and full detail will be provided through the trial plan.</p>	
<p>Item 5 – Provisional timescales*</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement – November 2022 (although stakeholder engagement will be conducted throughout the ACP process)</p> <p>ACP submission – February 2023</p> <p>CAA approval – March 2023</p> <p>AIC submission – March 2023</p> <p>Trial implementation date – April 2023</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 RNP Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) without an Approach Control proposals; this may impact Airspace Regulation resource and consequently timelines.</i></p>	
<p>Item 6 – Next steps</p> <p>Agree stakeholder list</p> <p>Develop stakeholder engagement materials</p>	

Item 7 – Any other business	
------------------------------------	--

Notes:

ACTIONS ARISING FROM ACP-2022-024 ASSESSMENT MEETING

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Stakeholder list	Vicki H	To share stakeholder list with CAA for their informal review	tbc

Air Navigation Solutions Ltd
ACP Sponsor