

**MINUTES OF THE PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF PORTLAND ATZ ASSESSMENT MEETING
HELD AT AVIATION HOUSE, GATWICK ON WEDS 21st SEPTEMBER 2022**

3 October 2022

Distribution list as below:

Present	Appointment	Representing
██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████
██████████	██	██████████
██████████	██	██████████
██████████	████████████████████	████████████████████
██████████	████████████████████	██████████

CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

CAA noted that the Statement of Need, Agenda and Assessment Meeting Presentation 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 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, including determining whether the proposal falls within the scope of a scaled CAP 1616 ACP for the introduction of RNP Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) without an Approach Control as described in CAP 1961,
- 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 stages of the airspace change process.

	ACTION
<p>Item 1 – Introduction</p> <p>The CAA Technical Regulator welcomed all attendees and read the CAA Opening Statement above. Following individual introductions, the CAA Technical Regulator invited Osprey to present the background slide pack for the establishment of the Portland ATZ proposal. Osprey ██████ highlighted that he had been experiencing issues with gaining access to the CAA Portal and the Password reset facility was not working. The Consultation and Engagement Regulator advised that she would raise the issues to assist in gaining access. Completed at the time of minutes publication.</p>	<p>Consultation and Engagement Regulator</p>
<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review) (Slides 4 to 7)</p> <p>Osprey presented the Statement of Need that had been submitted to the CAA prior to the Stage 1A Assessment Meeting. The presentation highlighted that the proposal for the establishment of an ATZ at Portland was on the basis of safety and was linked with the site being moved from Military Aviation Authority (MAA) jurisdiction to becoming a UK CAA licensed heliport. It was highlighted that the slides showing an aerial view of Portland with two circles on them were showing a 2nm radius and 1.75nm radius for information purposes only and was based upon the existing ‘H’ at Portland.</p>	

<p>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change (Slide 8)</p> <p>Osprey briefed the opportunities and issues that had been identified. It was highlighted that the proposal for the establishment of an ATZ would enable the provision of airfield and traffic information to increase situational awareness with student aircrew during critical stages of flight with rotary aircraft. The ATZ would also assist in reducing the potential for safety incidents and potential the risk of mid-air collision in the vicinity of the aerodrome.</p>	
<p>Item 4 – Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified (Slide9)</p> <p>Osprey briefed that the establishment of the ATZ would be work that is to be conducted in conjunction with the transition of the Portland Heliport from the MAA to CAA regulatory oversight. It was highlighted that some initial investigation work had commenced with regards to understanding who may be affected by the ATZ Proposal including the MOD. The Consultation and Engagement Regulator highlighted that law that CAA ATZ Policy Statement, it would be ‘engagement with aviators, local airfields and the MOD’ and not ‘consultation’ as per the slide. Osprey were also questioned as to whether they were intending to engage with any RPAS user groups and the CAA offered to assist in providing detail through the CAA RPAS Team. An offer was made to review the draft Engagement Plan should one be produced by Osprey.</p>	
<p>Item 5 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements (Slide 10)</p> <p>Osprey requested confirmation that in accordance with the CAA SARG Policy Statement Air Traffic Zones that the application would be considered as a Level 2C Airspace Change. The CAA Technical Regulator stated that further clarification was required with regard to the to the proposal due to the proposed location and proximity of the Danger Areas and that they could not allocate a provisional level at this stage, without further information. The CAA added that more information from the safety case for the proposal could assist in understanding the potential impacts to stakeholders and enable the CAA to provisionally allocate an appropriate level for the change. The Consultation and Engagement Regulator stated that a Level 2C would normally be allocated to a change above 7,000ft and strongly advised that the Engagement Plan would aid our understanding in the decision making process. Osprey re-iterated that the assumption of a Level 2C being allocated was based upon the CAA Policy Statement regarding ATZs dated December 2019. It was stated by the Consultation and Engagement Regulator that the Policy was guidance, however, the CAP1616 process was where the policy statement had been derived from and therefore each ACP would be considered under its own merits.</p>	
<p>Item 6 – Provisional process timescales* (Slide 11)</p> <p>The proposed timeline as per the slide was discussed; however, until Osprey provided a statement as to why they believed the ATZ application should be a Level 2C Airspace Change, the timeline could not be confirmed. It was highlighted by the Consultation and Engagement Regulator that the ATZ Policy Statement did not have specific timescales for engagements and stakeholders should have sufficient time to respond. Within the proposed timescales, Osprey were advised to be mindful of including the Christmas period in the their engagement timeline as it could result in a period of reduced response rates; this is something that could be considered in the Engagement Plan. It was suggested by Osprey that the implementation date of the ATZ and FRZ (if approved) could be tailored to fit the ongoing work with regards to licensing of the Heliport.</p> <p>It was proposed by the CAA that Osprey produce a statement to explain why this proposal should be classed as a Level 2C Airspace Change. This statement would be considered and would assist the CAA in finalising a timeline and determining the ACP Level.</p>	<p>Osprey ██████████</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 7 – Next steps</p> <p>The next steps were discussed. It was highlighted that the draft minutes would require to be submitted to the CAA for approval as soon as possible. Once approved, the minutes, agenda and presentation would require uploading to the CAA ACP portal. The CAA asked whether the consultant (Osprey █████) would be utilising their standard 4 part Safety Case. The CAA stated that these have historically not been published and the consultant (Osprey █████) stated he would investigate whether they had legitimate commercial reasons not to publish them on the CAA Portal. The CAA recommended that the sponsor should be as transparent as possible, especially with regard to their safety arguments. Osprey █████ confirmed that he would investigate and advise the Technical Regulator as soon as possible. Osprey would also provide the CAA with an impact statement with regards to why they considered that the ATZ proposal should be treated as a Level 2C Airspace Change.</p>	<p>Osprey █████</p>
<p>Item 8 – Any other business</p> <p>There was no other business to discuss and the meeting closed at 1545hrs.</p>	

ACTIONS ARISING FROM PORTLAND ATZ PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT MEETING

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Minutes	Osprey	Produce minutes of the Assessment Meeting	5 Oct 22
Portal Access	CAA - Communications and Engagement Regulator	Engage with ACP Portal support regarding issues being experienced with Password reset.	5 Oct 22
Statement	Osprey	Provide an impact statement to CAA regarding why the Portland ATZ proposal should be considered as a Level 2C ACP.	5 Oct 22
Safety Case	Osprey	Confirm to CAA whether a full 4 part Safety Case would be available for publication on the CAA Portal.	5 Oct 22

██████████
 ██████████