

on Primary Surveillance Radar (PSR) systems in the vicinity of BB Windfarm. XX notes three PSR's potentially impacted (again, noted below)

- Plan now to follow CAP 1616 Process.
- XX asks if all happy with Statement of Need. All confirm.
- XX asks when first turbine turning date is due? XX confirms this to be October 2027, but as always, could be subject to change.
- XX goes over Project Background. Notes this is far bigger than Seagreen 1. XX confirms Berwick Bank to be delivered over three phases (A, B & C). Discussion to be had over whether the Sponsor should seek to deliver this mitigation through a single ACP but deployed in three phases or a single deployment for the entirety of the airspace above the Project's Red Line Boundary. Agreement on Array Area of 47.6km offshore and 37.8km from the Borders coastline at St. Abbs.
- Conducted engagement with relevant stakeholders which resulted in issues raised.
- Long lead-in time until implementation.
- XX now gives slide of map of BB Windfarm as a whole and asks for questions. XX asks about cable line from shore and whether this is all underwater. XX confirms this is.
- XX talks of Baseline Impact. NE overlaps with 613C and 613D. Turbines can be picked up by PSRs; however, not expected to impact on aviation in anyway. XX points out slight error on previous slide – relating to the boundaries of Airway P18. Asks to be corrected ahead of slide being published. XX confirms this will happen.

Statement of Need

Current Situation:

Berwick Bank Wind Farm Ltd has recently submitted [Dec 22] it's Consent Application to the Scottish Government to develop a substantial offshore wind farm off the East Coast of Scotland. Located in the North Sea, in the outer Firth of Forth, Berwick Bank Wind Farm has the potential to deliver up to 4.1 GW of installed capacity, making it one of the largest offshore opportunities in the world. Construction is anticipated to occur between 2024-2026.

Issue:

As part of the Planning Process, Berwick Bank has engaged with all relevant aviation stakeholders to determine the impact of the Berwick Bank Wind Farm wind turbine generators on aviation PSRs and operations - in particular, NERL and the MOD. Both have confirmed that the development has the potential to have an adverse impact on their primary surveillance radar systems for the provision of air traffic control services in the vicinity of the Berwick Bank Wind Farm. As a result, Berwick Bank has acknowledged that a suitable mitigation must be developed for this Development to coexist with the operations of both NERL and the MOD.

PSRs potentially impacted:

- a. Leuchars Station PSR
- b. Deadwater Fell PSR
- c. Perwinnes PSR

Action:

Internal assessment of the mitigations available has led Berwick Bank Wind Farm Ltd to now wish to commence the initiation of a CAP1616 compliant airspace change proposal in order to manage the development of the airspace related mitigations. The Berwick Bank Offshore Wind Farm is of strategic importance to the UK and Scottish Government as they strive to achieve their Net Zero Targets and therefore, the Project is keen that the airspace change proposal is initiated as soon as possible.

ENR5.1 (Prohibited/Restricted/Danger Areas) AD-EGXX-2.17 (ATS Airspace) AD-EGXX-2.22 (Flight Procedures).

All altitudes from Surface to 20,000feet and above.

Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change

- XX discusses below points surrounding potential issues:

<p>Issues caused by the Proposal Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of clutter on ATC radar displays: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in safety. and/or <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced provision of ATS • Potential 'shadowing' of radar returns • Physical obstructions • Reduced performance of Communication, Navigation and Surveillance (CNS) Systems 	
<p>Item 4 – Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX discusses below points surrounding potential benefits; XX asks about first point on removal of radar shadowing/blanking and asks XX to explain, which he does. <p>Benefits of the Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of primary radar clutter through associated radar blanking. • Creation of an airspace structure that allows for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved safety; or • Safety remains 'at least as safe' as currently assessed. • Provision of ATS enhanced through creation of known air traffic environment. • Reduced impact of primary radar 'shadowing' 	
<p>Item 5 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX talks through details on slide (details below). Discusses this based on experience of Seagreen 1 as to why going for Level 2B. • Consent application is in. Anticipating no major issues. • Asking for early solution due to long-lead time on Project. <p><u>Details on Slide 8</u> Expectation (following experience of SSE's Seagreen 1 Application) of Level 2B Change due to being over the sea and minimal impact to other airspace users:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implications of potential impact on ATS means that Berwick Bank wish to ensure relevant stakeholders are aware of any potential changes and have the opportunity to comment on any proposal. • Project has a long lead time to implementation; however, Berwick Bank has near-term funding and consenting decisions meaning that an agreed mitigation solution is required several years prior to implementation <p><i>* When the sponsor submits their gateway materials for each Gateway at the agreed submission deadline, the period between this and the gateway decision will be an analysis by the CAA Airspace Regulatory team (Airspace Regulation) of the documentation submitted, for the purposes of making a recommendation to the CAA Gateway decision maker(s). In conducting the gateway assessment, the CAA is assessing the process employed and its compliance with the guidance stipulated within CAP 1616. It is not an assessment of the merits of the submission itself, which is reviewed at Stage 5 - Decision. We may request documentation from the sponsor that is referred to in the gateway submission but has not been provided as part of the Gateway submission materials. We may also request the sponsor to provide information by way of clarification relating to statements or assumptions made in the submission. Any further information sought by Airspace Regulation at this stage is for clarificatory purposes and is only for determining compliance with the CAP 1616 process.</i></p> <p><i>In any instance where a sponsor has not met the requirements of the process, we will inform them after the gateway decision and advise of next steps.</i></p>	
<p>Item 6 – Provisional process timescales*</p>	

- XX discusses process timescales (noted below). Looking for additional support with aim of bringing support in by Q1 2023.
- XX asks about “another party” and who this would be. Would they be internal to SSE or external. XX confirm this would be external appointment (BB contracted party).
- XX confirms these timescales will be revisited.
- Following a timeline analysis, conducted by the CAA Account Manager, the timeline as detailed below was agreed post Assessment Meeting

Stage	Gateway Date	Submission Deadline
Assessment Meeting	23 Jan 23	N/A
Stage 1 – Define	31 Mar 23	17 Mar 23
Stage 2 – Develop & Assess	29 Sep 23	15 Sep 23
Stage 3 – Consult	22 Mar 24	8 Mar 24
Stage 4 – Update & Submit	N/A	28 Jun 24
Stage 5 – Decide	29 Nov 24	N/A
Stage 6 – Implement	20 Dec 24 (AIRAC 03/2025)*	20 Dec 24

** This date may be subject to delay dependent upon construction schedule and Berwick Bank would not wish to implement an agreed change any earlier than necessary.*

- XX asks how long consultation will be? XX confirms from experience, this will be around six weeks. XX asks for these dates to be reviewed as unsure if enough turnaround time between Stages 3 & 4.

** 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 proposal; this may impact Airspace Regulation resource and consequently timelines.*

Item 7 – Next steps

- XX runs through next steps on slide, as noted below, and notes all others on call are free to read through these in own time.
- Some engagement has taken place as part of the planning process; however, further detailed engagement will concern specific aviation aspects of the proposal and the Design Principles with the following:
 - NERL to be engaged regarding specific impacts.
 - Ministry of Defence (MOD) to be engaged but likely to advance their own [technical] mitigation requirements. However, a [technical] mitigation solution (if required) could be formed in cooperation with a civil airspace solution. MOD has been engaged as part of the Section 36 Planning Process.
 - Those listed below:
 - Recipients of Perwinnes Radar:
 - Aberdeen Airport
 - Helicopter Operators:
 - Maritime Coastguard Agency Babcock
 - Bristows
 - British International Helicopters
 - CHC Scotia
 - Emergency Helicopter Support Units
 - NATMAC:
 - Members of NATMAC

Others:

- Any other person/organisation considered appropriate as CAP 1616 process is progressed.

Item 8 – Any other business

XX confirms the Provisional Level 2B, this will be confirmed at Stage 2.

Environment –

- XX - The environmental assessment requirements are given in CAP1616 Appendix B and CAP1616a - Environmental Requirements Technical Annex.
- In anticipation of this ACP being scaled as a Level 2B change, occurring over the sea, with no impact to traffic patterns over land, the Sponsor may be able to scope out or scale down the environmental impacts to a qualitative assessment. In this case, in accordance with CAP1616 paragraph B26, the Sponsor is required to present evidence to support this rationale. For example, a baseline survey of traffic patterns in the area would evidence if there are likely to be any consequential impacts below 7,000 ft. over land to other airspace users.
- Once Level 2B confirmed, environmental metrics such as noise, air quality, tranquillity and biodiversity are scoped out and the Sponsor only needs to assess CO2 emissions. These would depend on the additional track miles and fuel burn that is associated with all rerouted aircraft flightpaths as compared to the baseline (i.e. the current day scenario).
- The Sponsor is not a military sponsor and therefore, should consider the consequential impacts on both commercial and military operations.
- The Sponsor should also consider if any environmental stakeholders need to be liaised with.

ACPs/Scaling

- XX – Scaling for ACP. Scaling can be proposed by the sponsor., Stage 1 and 2 you'd have to developed Design Principles (DPs) and in Stage 2 you develop these options. Stage 3 you Consult. Stage 5 we consider whether further consultation needed. Asks XX if he has any further questions on Scaling – nothing asked, and XX confirmed that all was understood.
- XX – Previous two covered it all, really. The Sponsor should provide CAP 1616 Table E2 for the options considered at Step 2B and as a minimum qualitative discussion of the impacts against the baseline must be provided for Level 2B changes. In terms of the baseline option, it'd be very useful if the Sponsor can provide the current prevailing air traffic solution, frequency in number of movements and forecast growth as part of the description of its baseline. CAA also underlined that an indication with regards to the greenhouse gas benefits anticipated as a result of the windfarm project can be included in the options appraisal. This type of information may show the costs of GHG from an airspace change would be mitigated by the benefits of the overall windfarm project if there is any information readily available to be added in the options appraisal. XX – Question around number of tonnes of CO2 the Windfarm will save/offset. States this would be beneficial to add in to provide context of the environmental benefits of the windfarm. Confirmed under the current version 4 of CAP1616 the proposal would be Level 2B. Noted that there is a review of CAP1616 ongoing which does propose some potential change to the categorisation of ACP Levels. Encourages XX to respond to ongoing consultation. Due to long timescale, the updated version of CAP1616 is likely to be in place for this project.
XX confirms XX has Portal account and states if any assistance is needed, to contact her directly. This is a one-stop shop for all documentation. Anything which needs to be redacted must be done so and unredacted copy sent in the first instance to XX
- XX confirms detailed analysis will be done on Timescales notes in Item 6.
- Gateways take place the last Friday of every month.
- XX will send out wash-up email after call confirming all dates for minutes/deadlines, etc.

**ACTIONS ARISING FROM BERWICK BANK OFFSHORE WIND FARM AIRSPACE CHANGE
PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT MEETING**

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Timescales	XX	CAA to confirm timescales and gateway availability	1 Feb 23
Design Principles	Sponsor	Produce Design Principles for CAP1616, Stage 1B	17 Mar 23

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
ACP Sponsor