

MINUTES OF RADNOR BVLOS UAS TDA (ACP-2021-030) SPONSOR FEEDBACK MEETING HELD ONLINE ON 13TH FEBRUARY 2023

Present	Appointment	Representing
[REDACTED]	Airspace Regulator - Technical Airspace Regulator – Engagement and Consultation	CAA (Chair, Case Officer) CAA
[REDACTED]	Airspace Specialist – Engagement and Consultation	CAA
[REDACTED]	RPAS Technical Inspector RPAS Surveyor Accountable Manager	CAA CAA Nexus Nine (Sponsor)

CAA Sponsor Feedback Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was for the CAA to provide formalised feedback to the ACP Sponsor regarding ACP-2021-030, which was considered by the Airspace Change Regulator on 20th January 2023.

	ACTION
<p>Introduction</p> <p>CM opened the meeting ensuring the Sponsor was aware of each participant’s role. IM provided a brief introduction to her role as an Airspace Specialist (Engagement & Consultation).</p>	Nil
<p>Summary of Situation</p> <p>CM outlined that, following submission of ACP-2021-030 by the Sponsor in November 2022, that relevant regulators had reviewed the proposal through December 2022 and January 2023. The ACP was put before an Airspace Change Decision Meeting on 20th January 2023 where it was decided the proposal could not be approved in its current form.</p> <p>CM outlined that the timeline of this ACP had been delayed from the initial proposed dates. He noted that the Sponsor had looked at the impacts and proposed mitigations for this ACP which included the provision of a Danger Area Activity Information Service (DAAIS) and Letters of Agreement with emergency services operators.</p> <p>CM summarised that the ACP had not met the requirements in respect of Stakeholder Engagement and approval of an Operational Authorisation (OA) from the RPAS Team. CM invited the respective CAA representatives from these areas to provide the Sponsor with more detailed feedback.</p>	Nil
<p>Stakeholder Engagement</p> <p>AT and IM provided detailed feedback on the ACP Stakeholder Engagement aspects. It was noted that the Sponsor’s overall presentation of the ACP was good with clear methodology and detailing of the Stakeholders engaged during the two Engagement Periods. It was noted that the Sponsor had sufficient spread of Stakeholders to represent the airspace users. AT also noted that the environmental impact assessment conducted was particularly strong and went beyond the requirements for an ACP of this type.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Engagement and Consultation team identified several areas that had not met the requirements for an ACP:</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusion and follow up of Stakeholder discussions. The Regulator felt that the Sponsor could have pursued conversations further, citing the example that a reply had not been received from the Long Mynd Soaring Club following their request to alter the shape of the airspace proposal. It was felt that the Sponsor could have chased the Long Mynd Club for a reply. Furthermore, the BMAA had highlighted 6 flying sites that they felt the Sponsor should engage with; not all of these had been contacted. AT reminded the Sponsor that, whilst they had specified formal Engagement Periods, that discussions should be followed to conclusion where possible, even if they fall outside this period. • 2nd Engagement Period Design Changes. The Regulator felt that the Sponsor could have been clearer during the 2nd Engagement Period in explaining how the proposal had changed from the initial proposal. Whilst the Sponsor had provided links to the Airspace Change Portal, they could have provided maps and/or diagrams to show the evolution of the proposal and the rationale behind it. • Timeline of Changes. It was highlighted that the Engagement team felt that the proposed timeline changes for the ACP had not been adequately highlighted to Stakeholders; by better explaining this, a more accurate impact assessment could be conducted by Stakeholders. AT directed the Sponsor to Para 301 of CAP1616 for clarification. <p>MB provided an update of actions taken to renew Stakeholder engagement since the ACP Decision Meeting, including discussions with Long Mynd and Shobdon airfield. AT welcomed the fresh engagement but reminded the Sponsor that most engagement should take place within a formal engagement window; the Policy Statement in CAP1616 suggests this could be between 6 and 12 weeks (Section A3.1 (2) of the Policy states 'where it can be demonstrated the TDA will not interact with other established airspace structures, the engagement may be scaled to a maximum of 6 weeks). AT requested that the Sponsor submit a proposed engagement rationale and timeline to the Engagement Team for their review.</p> <p>AT suggested the Sponsor should separate any discussion of a permanent DA from this ACP; no permanent ACP has been submitted and this has the potential to confuse discussions.</p> <p>AT outlined how the Sponsor had detailed email addresses for Stakeholders to submit complaints regarding the ACP to the Operator. AT also requested that the Sponsor consider how these complaints would be forwarded to the Regulator, updating the ACP submission accordingly. She advised P95/96 of CAP 1616 provided further guidance.</p> <p>CM highlighted that the current NOTAM system would not allow Stakeholders the ability to review proposed TDA activity in advance. He requested the Sponsor review an alternative means of advising Stakeholders of proposed activity. IM suggested providing clarity to stakeholders on the notification for activation via NOTAM. MB updated that this had been discussed with some Stakeholders; the Sponsor suggested they are likely to use an email distribution list to advise of planned activity. This aimed to allow the Sponsor and Stakeholders to deconflict activity, where required.</p>	<p>MB</p> <p>MB</p> <p>MB</p>
<p>Operational Authorisation (OA)</p> <p>JD provided an update as to the issues relating to the renewal of the Sponsor's OA for BVLOS operations. He noted the renewal had been submitted in January 2022 but the full submission, including the detail of the Radnor TDA, was received in October 2022.</p> <p>MB requested a formal Oversight Report relating to this renewal.</p>	<p>JD</p>
<p>Item 7 – Any other business</p>	

<p>MB thanked all participants for their feedback on this ACP.</p> <p>CM requested MB write up minutes for this meeting ASAP for his approval and publication on the Airspace Change Portal.</p> <p>No further questions or business was noted, and the meeting closed.</p>	<p>MB</p>
---	------------------

Nexus Nine
ACP Sponsor