



Llywodraeth Cymru  
Welsh Government

**MINUTES OF ST ATHAN INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEM (ILS) AIRSPACE CHANGE PROJECT (ACP) ASSESSMENT MEETING HELD AT CAA HOUSE, GATWICK ON 21 MARCH 2019**

26 March 2019

CAA – Attention [REDACTED] (Account Manager)

<b>Present</b>	<b>Appointment</b>	<b>Representing</b>
[REDACTED]	Airspace Regulator (Technical) - Account Manager	CAA
[REDACTED]	Airspace Regulator (Engagement & Consultation)	CAA
[REDACTED]	Manager Aerodromes and ATM	CAA
[REDACTED]	Aerodrome Inspector (Operations)	CAA
[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	Airspace Regulator (Environmental)	CAA
[REDACTED]	Trainee Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
[REDACTED]	Economist	CAA
[REDACTED]	Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP)	CAA
[REDACTED]	Trainee Airspace Specialist (Environmental)	CAA
[REDACTED]	Aviation Team	Welsh Government (WG)
[REDACTED]	Consultant	Osprey
[REDACTED]	Consultant	Osprey



	ACTION
<p><b>CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement</b></p> <p>CAA confirmed receipt of the St Athan ILS Statement of Need (SoN) and that the relevant documents would be published together with minutes of the meeting on the CAA airspace change website. 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 CAP1616 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• for the Sponsor to present and discuss their SoN,</li><li>• to enable the CAA to consider whether the proposal concerned falls within the scope of the formal airspace change process,</li><li>• to enable the CAA to consider the appropriate provisional Level to assign to the change proposal.</li></ul> <p>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.</p>	
<p><b>Item 1 – Introduction</b></p> <p>■■■ welcomed all attendees and read the introductory statement above. ■■■ thanked the CAA for accommodating the meeting and outlined Osprey's support to the WG thus far.</p> <p>■■■ invited ■■■ and ■■■ to present the background slide pack in support of the St Athan ILS SoN dated ■■■ submitted in June 2018.</p>	
<p><b>Item 2 – St Athan Transition Overview</b></p> <p>■■■ provided a brief overview of the history of St Athan, its relationship with the Ministry of Defence (MoD) and development as an Aerospace Business Park and Maintenance Repair Organization (MRO) function.</p> <p>■■■ emphasised the economic importance of an instrument approach for MRO flights.</p>	
<p><b>Item 3 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</b></p> <p>■■■ and ■■■ presented (slides attached) the broad content of the SoN. The presentation highlighted the simple aim of the project to transition the ILS from</p>	



	ACTION
<p>Military Aviation Authority (MAA) to CAA regulatory framework and publish in the Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP). There was no anticipated change to the nature and scale of activity at St Athan. It was anticipated that the Design Principles would not change but the procedure required CAA regulatory approval to enable publication in the AIP.</p> <p>■ detailed the history of the introduction of the ILS and the underpinning premise of allowing aircraft to make a stable approach into St Athan vice the legacy radar vectored approaches. ■ emphasised that close consultation was undertaken between the MAA and CAA (Aerodromes and ATM) to ensure that the safety argument underpinning the introduction of the ILS would meet with CAA requirements once the aerodrome pursued a CAA licence to ensure a precision approach was retained at St Athan without a break on provision.</p> <p>■ clarified that the Article 205 Approval had been issued by the CAA.</p> <p>■ clarified that the Safety Assurance Documentation underpinning the instrument approach to a non-instrument runway had been approved by CAA Aerodromes as part of the Aerodrome Licensing process.</p> <p>■ confirmed that the CAA didn't require any additional information on the history of the MAA-CAA transition.</p>	
<p><b>Item 4 – Issues or Opportunities arising from proposed change</b></p> <p>The slides attached indicate the opportunities and issues identified by the Sponsor. ■ emphasised the key point as retaining a stable approach for large aircraft currently provided by an instrument approach - a key mitigation to runway excursion at St Athan. The removal of a stable approach was deemed a retrograde step in removing an important safety mitigation.</p>	
<p><b>Item 5 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements</b></p> <p>■ emphasised that nothing was changing with the ILS given the equipment was subject to an Article 205 Approval and the procedure had been assured by the CAA, there was an aspiration to keep the ILS in service from 1 Apr 19.</p> <p>■ stated this would not be possible and the procedure could not be put in the AIP without an ACP. ■ confirmed that the proposed airspace change fell within the requirements of CAP1616, it was considered a CAP1616 Level 1 project and that all the Gateways would need to be met.</p> <p>■ stated that the Sponsor could make a case in their Proposal to the CAA on scalability, the CAA would consider reductions to consultation timescales if it was felt that it could be justified in accordance with CAP1616 and described in the Consultation Strategy; however, all Gateways would need to be met. ■ stated that it was for the Sponsor to propose to the CAA what degree of scalability might be acceptable for this ACP. ■ reconfirmed the Sponsor had an opportunity to</p>	



	ACTION
<p>request a reduced consultation period (scale the consultation) so long as they felt there was justification for them to do so.</p> <p>█ noted the ability to make a case for scalability but expressed concern regarding CAA resource to manage the process, noting the 9 months that had already passed between SoN submission and Assessment Meeting.</p> <p>█ made a point of clarification that the procedure had not been approved by the CAA despite it having been reviewed by the CAA as part of the St Athan MAA CAA transition process. █ accepted that it may have been deemed satisfactory from a CAA Aerodromes perspective but not from a CAA Airspace perspective.</p> <p>█ stated the Sponsor should include detail on any projected growth and an increase in volume of aircraft. █ confirmed it would be minimal but would consider.</p> <p>█ briefed on the environmental assessment considerations. Any predicted increase in aircraft movements would be required for the noise assessment. Emphasising the need to justify and evidence any proposed deviation from the CAP 1616 process.</p> <p>█ recommended the submission of an economic plan as an appendix to the proposal.</p>	
<p><b>Item 6 – Provisional Process Timescales</b></p> <p>A provisional process timescale was not discussed in detail at the Assessment Meeting. The Sponsor will seek an additional opportunity to brief the CAA on a detailed timescale noting the CAA guidance provided at the assessment meeting on presenting options for scalability.</p> <p><i>POST MTG NOTE:</i></p> <p><i>The Sponsor intends to propose a scalable approach including the potential to combine Gateways and a much earlier implementation target. We would appreciate an indication of the earliest Gateway slot in 2019.</i></p> <p><i>The following are placeholder estimates only based on full CAP 1616 process:</i></p> <p><i>DEFINE Gateway: 25 Oct 19</i></p> <p><i>DEVELOP &amp; ASSESS Gateway: 31 Jan 20</i></p> <p><i>CONSULT Gateway: 24 Apr 20</i></p> <p><i>Formal ACP Submission: 19 Sep 20</i></p> <p><i>DECIDE Gateway: 26 Feb 21</i></p> <p><i>Target AIRAC: Nov 21</i></p>	█



	ACTION
<p><b>Item 7 – Next Steps</b></p> <p>█ reiterated that the timeline and ACP can be scaled if an acceptable proposal is put forward to the CAA and encouraged the Sponsor to engage with the CAA where additional advice and guidance is required. █ requested sight of the Draft Assessment Meeting Minutes and informed the Sponsor that a redacted version of the Minutes and supporting slides should be posted on the Portal within 2 weeks of the meeting.</p> <p>█ advised on the requirement (as a provisional level 1 ACP) to add a geographic area on the Portal as well.</p>	<p>█</p> <p>█</p>
<p><b>Item 8 – Any Other Business</b></p> <p>█ confirmed the EGSY designator would be in place from 1 Apr 19 and would meet Aeronautical Regulation and Control (AIRAC) 28 Apr 19.</p> <p>█ emphasised his role as the Account Manager for this project and openness to engagement on a proposed course of action.</p>	

█

WG Aviation Team