

ACP Ref	ACP Title	Sponsor	Date:	Assessor:
ACP-2020-92	Inclusion of Fast Jet Area (North) into UK AIP	MoD		

Reference	Question	Guidance Notes	Y/N or N/A	Justification
1	Is the proposed change appropriate for the operating environment?	Is the change appropriate for the airspace? Are the operational teams capable of managing the change? Is the change suitable given the geographical location? Is the change future proof?	Y	No real change from today
2	Is the analysis of the impact of the traffic mix on complexity and workload of operations complete and satisfactory?	Will the mix of traffic or volume of traffic change and is that workload manageable?	Y	Again - no real change
3	Have all relevant procedures been drafted and fit for purpose?	self explanatory	Y	LOA is in draft - yet to see MATS Part 2 updates and clarification required ref who in SARG will approve extended use in peak times - LOA Annex C - clarification given - will be head of AR
4	Has the ATC training plan been agreed?	self explanatory	N/A	
5	Is the training plan and gap analysis proportionate to the change being delivered?	self explanatory	N/A	
6	If required, have the simulations been appropriately managed and attended according to the change?	Are they timetabled? Is the simulation reflective of the final proposed change? Are the instructors competent to train on the new structures?	N/A	
7	Have the airspace users been adequately briefed?	Through flight safety committees or airline briefings or other engagement activities?	Y	Not yet - will be via AIP and SI - but do not anticipate any issues - this will be post ACP approval and come under ongoing oversight.
8	If the changes impact on other units or sectors, are agreements and procedures in place?	MOUs, LOAs or other evidence of engagement activities?	Y	LOA in draft
9	Have there been any equipment or functional system changes that need to be assessed?	Are ANO approvals required etc?	N/A	
10	Have local hazard assessments of the change been completed?	self explanatory	N/A	no change - however, when SI is done to state new DA names in MATS Part 2, then it will be subject to Hazard Analysis and under ongoing oversight
11	Have all mitigating actions from the local hazard assessment been completed?	self explanatory	N/A	However previous activations of FJAs N/S have resulted in a couple of MoRs which after investigation have produced mitigations to prevent re-occurrences - this is continually monitored as BAU.
12	Have all relevant documents and controller displays / information been updated to reflect the change, including AIP entries, maps and charts, radar displays and controller work position information?	self explanatory	N	But expect to be so prior to implementation - they have been identified as actions. LoA - SI - AIP
13	Is any delegation of ATS justified and acceptable? (If yes, refer to Delegated ATS Procedure).	self explanatory	N/A	

14	Have all danger area safety buffer requirements (or mitigation of these) been identified and described satisfactorily (to be in accordance with the agreed parameters or show acceptable mitigation)? (Refer to buffer policy letter.)	self explanatory	Y	FBZs
15	Do ATC procedures ensure the maintenance of prescribed separation between traffic within the new airspace structure or on the new ATS routes and traffic in adjacent airspace or proximate routes?	self explanatory	N	no change
16	If the new structure lies close to another airspace structure or overlaps an associated airspace structure, have appropriate operating arrangements been agreed?	self explanatory	Y	LoA
17	<b>Communication:</b> Is the evidence of communications infrastructure including RT coverage together with availability and contingency procedures complete and acceptable?	Is the airspace or procedures supported by appropriate RT capability and do the procedures include failures and limitations of the service (DOCs etc)	Y	no change
18	<b>Navigation:</b> Is there sufficient accurate navigational guidance and available to the correct range?	If procedures are predicated on conventional nav aids, do the procedures outline the coverage and failure modes?	Y	no change
19	<b>Surveillance:</b> If surveillance is available, have radar diagrams been provided, and do they show that the ATS route/airspace structure can be supported?	Are the procedures or is the airspace structure fully within the surveillance capability of the sponsor and are radar fail procedures available?	Y	no change
20	Are there direct cost impacts on air traffic control / management systems?	Detail whether there is a cost to the service provider as a result of the change, or as a result of not completing the change?	N	
21	Are there direct beneficial impacts on air traffic control / management systems?	Detail whether there is a benefit to the service provider as a result of the change, or as a result of not completing the change?	Y	Benefit is that the existing SUA will be captured within AIP
22	<b>Conclusion/Summary:</b>			
This is essentially no change in how military will use existing segregations or how civil will accommodate activations of the airspace however this will formalise the airspace and as such has prompted the creation of an LoA which will be of benefit. The detail will be in subsequent SIs to MATS Part 2s which will fall under ongoing oversight under change management.				
Should the ACP proceed to the next phase? Yes/No			Yes	