

**London Stansted Airspace Change Proposal (ACP)**  
**Stage 1, Step 1A - Assessment Meeting**  
**Thursday 24th January 2019**

**Attendees:**

**Civil Aviation Authority**

Airspace Regulator (IFP)  
Airspace Regulator (Technical)  
Airspace Regulator (Environmental)  
CAA PBN Implementation Lead  
Airspace Regulator (Technical)  
Principal Airspace Regulator (IFP)  
Airspace Regulator (Technical)  
Airspace Regulator (Communities and Coordination)  
Principal Airspace Regulator (Technical)  
Airspace Regulator (Technical)

**Stansted Airport Limited**

Operations Director  
Group CSR Director  
Flight Performance Manager  
ATM and Airfield Capacity

**Invited by Stansted Airport Limited**

NATS / FASI South  
Osprey Consulting Limited

**Minutes:**

**Introductions**

1. The CAA welcomed everyone and made a brief opening statement to fulfil their regulatory duties for a CAP1616 Assessment Meeting. They stated that this assessment meeting was not a formal 'Gateway' in the process.
2. The CAA confirmed that the purpose of this meeting would be to discuss the Stansted Statement of Need, so that the CAA was able to determine whether it met the criteria for an airspace change within the CAP1616 framework and, if so, to provide an indicative level for this airspace change. They acknowledged that Stansted Airport Ltd (STAL) had developed a slide pack in advance of this Assessment Meeting and confirmed the requirement for this to be published together with the minutes of this meeting on the CAA's ACP portal.

**Stansted's Proposal**

3. STAL gave an introduction and talked through the presentation highlighting the reasons for this airspace change proposal, which are defined in the Statement of Need (SoN). It was noted that this SoN was submitted to CAA in December and this will also be posted on the CAA's ACP portal following this meeting.

4. STAL confirmed that the principal outcomes expected from the change would be compliance with regulatory requirements, including SESAR, the implementation of further PBN Departures, which it was anticipated would improve continuous climb performance, improved compliance with Continuous Descent Approach procedures and the substantive removal of reliance on ground based navigational aids in accordance with CAA and DfT policy. It was noted by STAL that some community stakeholders had asked that the Airport expedite the change to make greater use of a PBN environment given the success of the previous PBN work undertaken at the airport.
5. Furthermore, by starting the process at this time, STAL would ensure that the changes introduced would be aligned with the wider airspace changes being considered across the south of the UK, as part of the FASI-S programme. This would be consistent with the request of the Aviation Minister and would support efforts to deconflict arrival and departure routes from other airports and more generally ensure a co-ordinated approach to airspace modernisation in accordance with DfT policy.

### Scaling

6. Given the scope of the SoN, the CAA indicated that it was likely that they would consider it as a level 1 classification. It was noted that this indication was indicative and that a final decision would be confirmed at the end of Stage 2 of the CAP1616 process.

### Timescales

7. A discussion was held regarding timescales and the CAA requested that, for planning purposes, STAL provided indicative dates for future Gateways leading up to Implementation. These are outlined in ANNEX A. STAL confirmed their desire to work with the CAA and other sponsors of airspace change, to find mutually acceptable dates through the process. STAL indicated that a Stage 1B Gateway meeting in July 2019 was likely and noted that this would align with the other airports in the FASI-S programme. STAL also noted that further dates would be indicative and provided for planning purposes only. STAL stated that it would endeavour to be flexible with proposed future gateway dates.
8. Where a Sponsor wanted to change, or look to amend their proposed timescales, these would need to be renegotiated and agreed with the CAA.
9. NATS confirmed that the FASI-S programme (via the ACOG) will be co-ordinating ACP timelines across all airports in the south of the UK, to ensure the programme is implemented effectively.

### Process

10. CAA confirmed that they would be appointing an "Account Manager" for STAL who will act as a Project Manager to co-ordinate activities. The appointed manager will also act as the focal point for liaison with the appropriate CAA technical leads.
11. The CAA confirmed that, although FASI-S was a programme encompassing many airports, with interdependent proposals, the STAL ACP and adherence to the CAP1616 process will be treated separately for each airport.

## Consultation

12. The CAA emphasised the need to engage with stakeholders throughout the process. Formal consultation is one method but there is choice regarding how this engagement is carried out in stages 1 and 2. Stage 3 is required to be formal consultation, in accordance with established principles.
13. The CAA also advised STAL that although it is not a specific process requirement, it would be wise to develop an Engagement Strategy at an early stage to document how they intend to engage with stakeholders throughout the airspace change process. The CAA confirmed that a Consultation Strategy would be required at Stage 3 and advised that efforts should be made to avoid multiple consultations for the same area by different airports.

## Design

14. The sponsor and their APD should engage with the CAA IFP section if there is likely to be any deviations from IFP standards.

## Environment

15. The CAA advised that CAP1616 is clear on which environmental metrics are required and highlighted the need to use WebTAG to analyse impacts. If STAL proposed any alternative metrics CAA requested, they be advised and agreed with them. STAL also stated that their proposal would build on previous NPR work done and provide more continuous climbs and better enable Continuous Descents for Runway 04.

## Scalability

16. STAL asked about how the CAA proposed process and management of Planned and Permanent Redistribution (PPR) of traffic fitted with this process. In particular whether there was scope for scalability of the process if PBN replication of routes was deemed the most appropriate option for aspects of the proposed ACP.
17. The CAA confirmed that they were leading the process to develop the rules around PPR, and that they are under development. The CAA advised that the consultation for the proposed PPR process would take place in April to June 2019 and that would provide an opportunity for Sponsors to comment on which elements they propose might be scalable. The CAA confirmed that the proposed ACP will be based on CAP1616, noting that elements of this process are scalable.

## Validity

18. Given the scale of the FASI-S programme, a large number of airports will be consulting over the coming years; if STAL is successful in obtaining approval for their airspace change, it was conceivable that it might not be possible to meet an agreed implementation date if implementation was predicated on another separate airspace change proposal. STAL asked, if these circumstances were to arise how long the approval would remain valid for and in what circumstances further consultation would need to be undertaken.

19. The CAA stated that, it was not possible to objectively define a period of validity. They advised STAL that they should seek to be clear with all stakeholders throughout the engagement stages and into formal consultation of any known risks. Should STAL not be able to meet an agreed implementation date, whether due to its own actions or due to reasons beyond its control, it should discuss this with the CAA and a decision would be taken based on the specific circumstances at the time.
  
20. STAL thanked the CAA for their advice and commented that it might be possible to mitigate this risk by implementing, or partially implementing, any future designs within the current air traffic network so that they can be easily adapted, perhaps by the removal of stop climb to also fit in with any future network design. The CAA agreed that this might provide a practical solution and that it would be necessary to seek regulatory support for this approach.

## Conclusions

21. Following the presentation, CAA thanked the STAL team for the presentation and confirmed that the proposal in the Statement of Need falls within the scope of the formal airspace change process and the ACP will be given an indicative Level 1 classification which would be confirmed at the end of Stage 2 of the CAP 1616 process.
22. STAL stated that the SoN will be submitted to the portal within the next two weeks, now that it appeared that technical issues with 'logins' had been resolved.
23. The CAA confirmed that this meeting's minutes and slides will also be posted on the CAA's portal. STAL was asked to submit draft minutes and slides to CAA before Thursday 7th February 2019.

## ANNEX A

Target indicative dates for CAP1616 Gateways.

Define (1B)	26 July 19
Develop & Asses (2)	31 Jan 2020
Consult (3b)	26 June 2020
Formal Submission	01 June 2021

Target AIRAC                      13/2021