

**MINUTES OF ACP-2023-075
TRIAL OF AN RNP APPROACH TO RUNWAY 03 AT BIGGIN HILL AIRPORT
HELD ONLINE ON MONDAY 23 OCTOBER 2023**

Monday 23 October

2023 All Attendees

Present	Appointment	Representing
██████████	Airspace Change Account Manager	CAA
██████████████████	Principal Airspace Regulator (IFP)	CAA
██████████	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
██████████████	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
██████████	Airspace Regulator (Engagement & Consultation)	CAA
██████████	Airspace Regulator (Engagement & Consultation)	CAA
██████████	Airspace Regulator (Environment)	CAA
██████████	ATM Inspector	CAA
██████████████	CEO Biggin Hill Airport	Biggin Hill
██████████	Head of Air Traffic Services	Biggin Hill
██████████████	ATC Support & Compliance Manager	Biggin Hill
██████████	ACP Support	Biggin Hill
██████████████	ACP Consultant	Biggin Hill
██████████████	ACP Consultant	Biggin Hill

Apologies

██████████	Airspace Regulator (Environment)	CAA
------------	----------------------------------	-----

CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

CAA noted that the following agenda and presentation 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.

	ACTION
<p>Item 1 – Introduction</p> <p>Introductions from the CAA and the Biggin Hill attendees and the CAA Account Manager read out the CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement.</p> <p>The CAA noted the change in ACP reference numbers, as the proposal has changed from a full ACP to a Trial.</p>	

<p>Biggin Hill thanked the CAA for accommodating the change to the ACP and to allow the new Statement of Need to be submitted.</p>	
<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</p> <p>█ read out the Statement of Need for the proposed Trial (slide 3).</p> <p>The CAA queried the purpose of the sentence in the 3rd paragraph, which reads “The risk of progressing through a lengthy and expensive Level 1 ACP to fail, again, at the last IFP Regulatory hurdle by means of largely subjective issues cannot be mitigated.” The CAA stated that not all level 1 ACPs are lengthy or have to be expensive.</p> <p>█ responded that this question will be answered in the forthcoming slides.</p> <p>CAA also asked what was ‘innovative’ about the trial. █ said that the use of Radius-to-fix (RF) within the RNP APCH procedure would be a first of kind in the UK.</p>	
<p>Item 3 – Background Information</p> <p>█ read out the background information (slide 4), outlining the items on the previous ACP which had been successful, but that it was unsuccessful due to failing to satisfy the CAA’s statutory duty to maintain a high standard of safety.</p>	
<p>Item 4 – Issues identified in the previous ACP</p> <p>(Slide 5) █ provided a summary of the issues raised by the CAA on the previous ACP, which are available at CAP2500, para 81, a-i. These issues were largely around the IFP design.</p> <p>The CAA had raised some tangible issues, such as the procedure was not PANS Ops compliant, however several subjective issues were highlighted by the CAA, primarily focussed on pilot workload.</p> <p>The issues raised by the CAA were presented to Biggin Hill Airport but did not appear to take account of evidence that the Airport had, at the suggestion of the IFP team, collated via ground sims and live flight trials in support of the ACP, to mitigate the risks highlighted by the CAA. CAA did not accept this evidence, citing a cumulative impact of all these issues.</p> <p>Biggin Hill is concerned that, due to the subjectivity of these issues, any future design could still be subject to the same issues, as evidence/mitigation would not necessarily be proven via flight simulation alone. Therefore, the proposal is to test a different procedure to the one proposed in the last ACP, mitigating the factors raised in CAP2500 to the greatest extent possible and carry out a trial to capture evidence around the perceived increase in workload in Class G airspace. Biggin Hill believe a c.6-month trial will capture any evidence of these issues occurring. If the trial is successful, Biggin Hill propose they would look to take the procedure forward into a full ACP.</p> <p>█ asked the CAA if this had answered the earlier question regarding the Statement of Need? The CAA responded that it depends on purpose of the trial, as a trial shouldn’t be carried out to mitigate any potential risks associated with time and costs, . █ confirmed that the trial would be on a new and innovative approach procedure, most likely with a Radius to Fix, none of which are permanent procedures currently in the UK, so is therefore an innovative design.</p> <p>The CAA stated that as this is about innovative design, rather than risk of time/cost, the Statement of Need should be updated to reflect that.</p> <p>█ responded that Biggin Hill were aiming to be transparent about the reasons for this trial but in order to progress, it needed to address and mitigate some of the concerns that were raised from CAP2500. However, if that sentence is not necessary, then it can be removed.</p> <p>ACTION – Biggin Hill will update the Statement of Need and publish Version 2 on the CAA Portal.</p>	<p>Biggin Hill</p>

<p>Item 5 – Actions taken to address issues</p> <p>■ read out slide 6.</p>	
<p>Item 6 – Provisional indication of scaling level and process requirements</p> <p>■ stated the reason why Biggin Hill would like to progress a trial (slide 7) and confirmed that all details will be contained within the Trial Plan.</p> <p>The CAA asked if, from the ATC aspect, CAP670, GEN03 will be satisfied? GEN03 takes account of operational trials, equipment, procedures, process from an ATC perspective. All those elements will need to be satisfied (CAP670, GEN03, Part B, section 4, page 18).</p> <p>■ thanked the CAA for the references, and they have been noted for inclusion.</p>	
<p>Item 7 – Provisional Timescales</p> <p>Biggin Hill aim to submit the Trial Plan to the CAA by the end of Q1 (March) 2024. This is based on the requirements of the current edition (4th) of CAP1616. However, Biggin Hill are aware of the forthcoming new edition of CAP1616 and would like to know if any significant changes to the trial process can be expected.</p> <p>The CAA confirmed that the new version of CAP1616 can be expected in the next few weeks, with the stand-alone documents pertaining to Trials and Temporary Changes being published shortly afterwards. The CAA stated that it is not drastically different to the existing document, however the intention is for the process to be more involved, with increased communications and engagement between the CAA and the sponsor. The CAA stated that they would check to see if there was any information contained in the new version of CAP1616 that they would be able to share with Biggin Hill ahead of publication.</p> <p>■ asked if Biggin Hill can expect guidance from the CAA as we inform them of the plans? The CAA confirmed that it expects the sponsor to break down the work and engage with them in an iterative process. The CAA will be available to provide guidance throughout.</p> <p>■ stated that as part of the trial approval, the project will also need IFP approval. Following that IFP approval, according to current CAP785B, the procedure will then need validation. Therefore, the timeline would be to submit by end March 2024, the decision period, depending on the trial plan submission, should be 28 days, there would then be a validation period prior to live trial taking place. Therefore, the live trial would not be expected to commence until c.Q3 2024</p>	<p>CAA</p>
<p>Item 8 – Proposed Stakeholder Engagement</p> <p>■ laid out the proposed stakeholder engagement plan, in accordance with the existing criteria in edition 4 of CAP1616 (slide 8).</p> <p>The CAA advised that NATMAC members should be added to the stakeholder list.</p> <p>ACTION – Biggin Hill will add NATMAC members to the stakeholder engagement plan.</p>	<p>Biggin Hill</p>

Item 9 – Any Other Business

The Account Manager reminded Biggin Hill to take into account the AIS cycle when considering the time frames.

The IFP Regulator offered the CAA team's support to provide guidance if required and are keen to have a more collaborative process.

The Technical Regulator noted that Biggin Hill intend to engage with the CAA on questions concerning the design and that we should engage in a transparent process. ■ also stated that the safety case will need to be robust and that the ATS Inspector should be kept in the loop.

The Engagement and Consultation Regulator stated that an engagement plan might be beneficial, and the CAA would be happy to review this, although approval is not required. For a trial the requirement is to carry out targeted engagement with aviation stakeholders (airspace users, air navigation service providers and airports) and it is the sponsor's responsibility to identify relevant stakeholders and provide a rationale for those they have identified or excluded. They also stated that during engagement, Biggin Hill will need to ensure they are very clear on what this ACP is trying to achieve, to avoid confusion with the previous ACP. It is up to Biggin Hill to decide on the time for engagement, however the submission will require a rationale, 6 weeks is usually a good starting point. The Regulator provided guidance on what evidence of engagement activity is expected in the report. This should summarise the results of engagement activity, setting out how feedback has/has not influenced the final proposal, i.e., highlight what stakeholders have said and what you have done (and why) in light of that feedback. The report must also include a list of targeted stakeholders and rationale for selecting them, a summary of engagement methodology/ approach and timeline (with rationale for duration), copies of engagement documentation/ materials (i.e., how you have explained the proposal to stakeholders) and responses, and analysis of the responses.

The Environmental Regulator requested confirmation on the length of trial, as this impacts the noise analysis requirements. ■ confirmed that it is intended to have a 6-month trial. The Regulator confirmed that the requirements are laid out in CAP1616 Appendix B, paragraph B88. Further details are in paragraphs B86-B89, and it was confirmed that the new version of CAP1616 does not include many changes. The Regulator advised that the noise assessment be included in the Trial Plan, so that it can be assessed and the stakeholder engagement which needs to take place can be confirmed.

■ asked if it is possible to do the noise assessment up front and send that to the CAA in advance of the Trial Plan, which can then be used to confirm the stakeholder engagement requirements. ■ confirmed this was acceptable, however the noise impacts will depend on the design, which will depend on the operational and IFP elements which could be informed from industry engagement.

The Engagement & Consultation Regulator clarified that there are two elements of engagement, the initial engagement with the industry stakeholders which will inform the trial plan and then an 'inform' to non-aviation stakeholders of the impacts, which will only be known once the design is accepted. The scope of that will be informed by the noise assessment.

The Biggin Hill ATS Inspector highlighted the importance of the Safety Case and considerations of Redhill, London City, Gatwick, Kenley, and Heathrow. ■ reiterated the importance of GEN 03 CAP670 for both the tower and approach functions and that subject to the output of the safety case, conversion training will need to be satisfied.

The IFP Regulator highlighted the dynamic environment around Biggin Hill and there are HEMS operators looking to implement PINS operations to the north of the airport (Kings College Hospital). Engagement with these operators is very important for this process, as it could influence/inform the design proposals.

Item 10 – Next Steps

█ thanked the CAA team for their open and transparent engagement.

Biggin Hill will draft the minutes and provide them to the CAA for review. The redacted minutes, along with the meeting presentation will need to be published on the CAA Portal by 7 November 2023.

ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE BIGGIN HILL TRIAL ACP ASSESSMENT MEETING

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Meeting Minutes	Biggin Hill	Provide draft meeting minutes to the CAA for review.	31 October 2023
CAP1616	CAA	Check if any trial specific information can be shared with Biggin Hill, prior to publication of the new CAP1616 documents	7 November 2023
CAA Portal	Biggin Hill	Upload the redacted meeting minutes and the presentation to the CAA Portal.	7 November 2023
Statement of Need	Biggin Hill	Update Statement of Need and publish Version 2.0 on the CAA Portal.	7 November 2023

Biggin Hill Airport
ACP Sponsor