

**MINUTES OF KINGS COLLEGE HOSPITAL (KCH) PINS ASSESSMENT MEETING
HELD ONLINE ON 15 JUNE 2023**

Date: 15 June 2023

Present

[REDACTED]

Appointment

[REDACTED]

Representing

Sponsor
Sponsor
Sponsor
CAA
CAA
CAA
CAA
CAA
CAA
CAA
CAA
CAA
CAA

CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

CAA noted that the Agenda, Presentation and ATM Safety Questionnaire 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 1616 Part 1C,
- 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.

Item 1 – Introduction

[REDACTED] opened the meeting and led the introductions. He read the opening statement (above) on behalf of the CAA. He stated that the required documents were received in advance and will be published with the minutes on the portal. He explained this meeting is an assessment meeting and not a gateway.

Item 2 – Who are SAS and AACKSS? Why do we see a need for IFR in HEMS?

[REDACTED] provided background to this HEMS application explaining that the sponsor has 6 HEMS aircraft with 4 Air Ambulance charity partners and operates more than 11000 HEMS flights per year. He provided a map of the location of bases, illustrating the impacts of terrain.

He explained it is part of AACKSS strategy to increase operating hours and to improve patient outcomes. Due to weather constraints, approximately 1 in 3 patients cannot be conveyed to hospital by air at present and some cannot be reached at all by helicopters.

Item 3 - UK HEMS suitability to IFR integration

■ explained the UK HEMS was very suitable for IFR integration because of, amongst other reasons, the favourable operating altitudes and temperatures, short sectors, good availability of IFR aerodromes, widespread use of remote weather stations, well-established multi-pilot HEMS and SOPs, and many pilots with offshore multi-crew IFR experience from offshore operations. The target aircraft (AW169) has full RNP APCH certification including LNAV/VNAV/LP/LPV, BaroVNAV, RNP 0.3, and RNP AR APCH.

Item 4 - Statement of Need (discussion and review)

■ confirmed that the CAA was happy with the wording of the Statement of Needs. ■ asked if the application included both arrivals and departures and ■ confirmed this.

Item 5 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change

■ explained the opportunity was to enable new operational capability to improve patient outcomes, both in transfer to hospital and also accessing primary HEMS patients by using the PINS as a let-down procedure through cloud.

The procedure can also reduce noise, risk and increase predictability because it allows transit at IFR flight altitudes instead of using low-level VFR routings.

■ explained that issues to address could include the need to establish a RMZ/TMZ (not currently expected but to be determined from the safety analysis) that would take the project outside of the scope of Part 1C. Also the safety case would address risk of MAC (whilst transiting from IFR to VFR in Class G) and the robustness of safeguarding. In addition, the benefits to be gained could be limited by the policies applied, eg proceeding VFR and the minimum OCH policy.

Item 6 – Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified

■ presented some illustrative concepts for KCH PINS, identified significant obstacles and discussed the impact of operation in the London area.

Some of the site consideration at KCH are:

- Operation in the London CTR including proximity to LCY and LHR. NATS has requested the sponsor to minimise track miles within CAS.
- The procedure aims to remain well clear of Kenley.
- It is not an obstacle rich environment to the South/West/East of KCH.
- Whether SVFR can be used to meet intent of VFR segment if authorised by the ATC.
- The PINS departure might follow the approach track rather than MAP as this a preferable direction for, eg, Redhill.
- Noise benefits are possible if, instead of flying at 1000ft, helicopters can fly at 1500-2000ft and use the PINS to descend through cloud.
- A desire to future proof the procedure if possible towards proceed visual, eg potentially keep the MAP closer to the helipad to optimise for proceed visual in fullness of time. ■ noted that the procedure will need to comply with the Pans Ops and UK notified design criteria for the position of the mapt (PinS) waypoint.
- A likely maximum 5 deg final approach angle would be applied to operate with up to 20kts of tailwind with an acceptable ROD under Cat H. Noting, as above, that the procedure will need to comply with relevant criteria.

Item 7 – CAP 2520 – discussion

■ highlighted some specific considerations from CAP2520.

He asked about the application of the OCH calculations. ■ stated that the calculation of the procedure LNAV published OCA(H) value will be dependent on the design and the obstacles assessed within the FAS and MAP segments. If the resultant OCH values is less the 500' OCH, the OCH will be raised to 500'.

■ stated that the slot allocation concept for a conventional airfield was not appropriate since access to the hospital was restricted by coding publication and co-ordinated by the HEMS desk. He explained that a concept will be developed for the application. ■ asked how two aircraft going to the same hospital would be co-ordinated today and ■ explained this would be unlikely but, if required, it would be coordinated by the HEMS desk.

■ showed the situation display of the ACANS system from Airbox and explained the source of data and its operation.

Item 8 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements

■ confirmed that the ACP would follow the CAP1616 Part 1C requirements as a scaled Level 1 change. He advised that the requirements of Part 1C are reduced compared to a full change process and is documented in CAP1616.

Item 9 – Provisional process timescales¹

■ presented draft timescales based on CAP1616 Part 1c process and on the need to complete the work by March 2024 for DfT funding. It was agreed this was tight timescales, especially since there is a need for a database driven flight validation (ie no manual input) before the final procedure is approved.

■ confirmed that the Section 16 letter from DfT to CAA includes a constraint to complete work by the 24 March 2024 and said he would investigate what alleviations are possible (**ACTION**).

■ presented a draft approach to engagement. ■ suggested checking for hang gliding sites near to proposed procedures for additional affected stakeholders. ■ said he would provide an up-to-date NATMAC distribution list. (**ACTION**)

Item 10 – Next steps

■ requested that the draft minutes be provided by 23 June 2023. (**ACTION**)

Item 11 – Any other business

■ informed the sponsor that they should be aware of CAP2304 Appendices C and D when designing the PinS IAPs.

■ explained the MET approach in the safety questionnaire will need expanding and offered to provide questions as an input to a discussion on this. (**ACTION**) There was some discussion on the relevance of CAP437 and in particular, how a forecast at an HLS might be generated. In the absence of a destination forecast the sponsor would only launch with two suitable alternates (OMA) - this is not required offshore. ■ also asked if adjacent sites could be used for certified weather info. Although the normal validity range for TAF and METAR appears to be 8km, offshore operations are allowed to use auto data from a site within 10nm.

■ explained that the economic assessment requirements were for light touch at stage 2 with relevant impacts (positive or negative) included, using table E2 of CAP1616 but only qualitative. This assessment should be included in any consultation materials.

¹ The timeline agreed may become subject to change by the CAA. As outlined in CAP 2541 it is not the CAA's intent to conduct a re-prioritisation of all ACPs currently in progress, but only to prioritise when we believe this is required. Such prioritisation will be conducted on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with the principles outlined in CAP 2541. Should it be considered necessary to reprioritise an ACP a member of the Airspace Regulation team will contact the sponsor directly.

ACTIONS ARISING FROM KINGS COLLEGE HOSPITAL PINS ASSESSMENT MEETING

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Engagement	■	Provide an up-to-date NATMAC distribution list	Completed 15 June 2023
Timescales	■	Investigate alleviations regarding the March 2024 deadline	Completed 16 June 2023
Minutes	■	Provide draft minutes to CAA for review	23 June 2023
MET	■	Provide questions on the proposed MET approach	30 June 2023

Specialist Aviation Services Ltd
ACP Sponsor