

**MINUTES OF “ACP-2022-044”
Aviation House and remote
16th JANUARY 2023**

Present	Role	Organisation
██████████	Airspace Change Account Manager	CAA
██████████	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
██████████	Airspace Regulator (Engagement & Consultation)	CAA
██████████	RPAS Technical Inspector	CAA
██████████	Airspace Specialist (Engagement & Consultation)	CAA
██████████	Regulation Director	Flylogix Ltd
██████████	Remote Operator	Flylogix Ltd
Apologies	Role	Organisation
██████████	Airspace Regulator (Environment)	CAA
██████████	RPAS Sector Lead	CAA

CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

The CAA has received the Statement of Need, Assessment Meeting Agenda and Presentation 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.

The purpose of the Assessment Meeting as set out CAP1616 is for the Change Sponsor to present and discuss their Statement of Need, provide information on how it intends to fulfil the requirements of the airspace change process and present its provisional timescales. Lastly, the sponsor is required to provide information on how it intends to meet the engagement requirements of the process.

	ACTION
<p>Item 1 – Introduction</p> <p>Assessment meeting opened following meeting for ACP-2022-043.</p> <p>All attendees introduced themselves in the call. ██████ gave introduction and explained fire escapes etc. ██████ gave the Opening Statement (see above) ██████ declared the Submission (ACP ACP-2022-044) meets the requirements for the Airspace Change Proposal and thus this meeting is being undertaken.</p> <p>██████ commented that redacted copies of relevant materials pertaining to this ACP must be uploaded to the Airspace Change Portal</p>	<p>None</p> <p>FLYLOGIX</p>
<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</p> <p>Presentation given by ██████ setting out the requirement to conduct BVLOS flights to offshore oil and gas platforms. Flylogix has been contracted by multiple operators throughout the oil and gas industry, to perform methane survey flights across the North Sea area.</p> <p>██████ described how the need was for segregated airspace to operate the RPA within. The proposal would be designed around the following:</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Flexible Danger Area” airspace. This was used to describe a Temporary Danger Area that is notified in a different way – with an operational area designated by the AIC and then the specific Danger Area published by NOTAM. • Cover four areas North, Central, Southern North Sea and the West of Shetland • Surface to 1,300ft ASL • The operations are to be conducted over a nine-month period, moving between the four areas. The airspace construct will only be active for the period of each flight (4 hours) with up to 3 flights a week across all areas. The total time the airspace is in place is therefore less than 90 days. It was discussed if the area of operation could be notified for nine month but the activation limited to 90 days. Christian Morton will consult from a technical regulation perspective with regards to how each NOTAM’ed structure is subsequently regulated for duration, coordinates etc. • Airspace is Class-G 	
<p>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change.</p> <p>█ described the limitations TDAs that have been used for previous operations. Specifically in order to reduce the volume of segregated airspace, Flylogix has been designing TDA corridors to enable the RPA to fly offshore to the desired assets and carry out a measurement survey. The challenge with this approach is that it results in a complex airspace structure that has to be planned in advance – leading to a lack of flexibility.</p> <p>It was asked, with the creation of a “Flexible Danger Area” upon activation would this mean the entire volume of airspace be segregated?</p> <p>█ replied that only a corridor within the “Flexible Danger Area” would be segregated to allow the RPA to conduct its flight. This would be communicated directly by email to the ANSP and other Stakeholders as well as by NOTAM.</p> <p>█ discussed that this proposal was not a new type of airspace, but a TDA notified in a different way. █ agreed to confirm this and discuss the concept with others within the CAA.</p> <p>There was a discussion on the length of the TDA and CM suggested that if the TDA was not active for more than 90 days it might be possible for the operating area to be in place for more than 90 days. He agreed to check this.</p> <p>█ suggested that the TDA that was activated would need to be checked by the CAA in advance of activation. █ replied that the TDAs could be submitted to the CAA in advance as they would be planned in advance.</p> <p>It was discussed that ACP-2022-043, 044 and 045 were all submitted by Flylogix for different parts of the North Sea. It was agreed that combining into one ACP could simplify the process – as many Stakeholders are the same. It was agreed that all three applications would continue at the moment but Flylogix would make a decision before the Stakeholder Engagement starts and communicate it to the CAA.</p>	<p>█ to confirm that having an area of operation and activating by NOTAM and other means is acceptable</p> <p>█ to discuss limit of 90 days and how it applies to activations</p> <p>█ to work with others and decide if there is one</p> <p>█ to decide if there is one or multiple ACPs for TDAs</p>
<p>Item 4 – Process Requirements</p> <p>Engagement</p>	

<p>█ went through the requirements for engagement . He discussed that Flylogix had experience of the process and following a similar process was proportionate</p> <p>█ advised that although not a requirement of the process, the sponsor may wish to capture their proposed engagement approach and materials and submit these to the CAA for comment prior to commencing engagement.</p> <p>█ observed that some GA stakeholders will be local to only one of the four proposed areas and this should be considered before and during engagement if the ACPs are combined.</p> <p>.</p> <p>█ also suggested that during engagement, the sponsor should provide stakeholders with a full roadmap of future plans to give them a full picture of their objectives, i.e. their proposed future trials and how they are part of a pathway to integration.</p> <p>█ explained the requirements post-engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of a report summarising results of engagement activity and how feedback has/hasn't influenced the final proposal • The report must include a list of targeted stakeholders and rationale for selecting the, a summary of engagement methodology and timeline, original engagement documentation/materials, original responses and analysis of the responses • Sponsor must explain how they plan to collate, monitor and report to the CAA on the level and content of complaints during the TDA operation period. <p>It was pointed out that any change to traffic below 7000ft in a residential area would need to be considered. (Para 302 of CAP1616).</p> <p>It was also pointed out that if the TDA interacted with other airspace structures then the length of the engagement period must be considered.</p> <p>Environmental</p> <p>█ stated that CAP1616 para B81-85 for temporary airspace changes and CAP1616 para B86-89 for airspace trials must be considered.</p> <p>Operational Authorisation</p> <p>█ suggested that to ease confusion and to aide in clarity rather than submitting a technical variation Flylogix should create and submit a new OSC.</p> <p>█ also advised Flylogix to reassess the overall risk picture and both Operational and Technical mitigations. This should be in line with the new AMC.</p> <p>█ advised Flylogix to take other nearby Commercial RPAS operations and operators into consideration for possible Stakeholder Engagement</p>	<p>ACTION – █ to provide Flylogix with the current NATMAC list.</p> <p>ACTION – Flylogix are to ensure the ACP Portal is kept up to date throughout the process.</p> <p>ACTION – Flylogix - Submit OSC to CAA RPAS Sector</p> <p>ACTION – Flylogix – cross check ACP Portal for other RPAs operators in the area</p>
<p>Item 5 – Provisional process timescales</p> <p>█ outlined provisional timescales identified so far. Flylogix's intends to begin operations from July 2023.</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement to start – 17th February.</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement to end – 31st March (6 weeks)</p> <p>Submission to CAA by 14th April</p>	<p>None</p>

<p>CAA decision by 19th May to meet 29th June AIC</p> <p>Planning a nine-month trial until April 2024. This will be cancelled if the planned next step of conducting operations outside a TDA and within more integrated airspace occurs sooner</p> <p>The provisional timescale was agreed as suitable.</p>	
<p>Item 6 – Next steps</p> <p>A copy of the meeting minutes will be sent to CAA for approval prior to being uploaded to the Airspace Change Portal.</p> <p>The agenda and presentation for the meeting (redacted) shall be put on the ACP portal by Flylogix</p> <p>Redacted minutes shall then be added by 30th January to the portal</p>	<p>ACTION - Flylogix: submit Minutes to [REDACTED] by email</p> <p>Action – Flylogix to update ACP portal with agenda and presentation</p>
<p>Item 8 – Any other business</p> <p>After no further questions the meeting was adjourned</p>	

[REDACTED]