

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Airspace Change Process

Post Implementation Review Data Request (Scaled)

ACP Project Reference:	ACP-2019-075		
Title of Airspace Change:	Land's End Transit Corridor		
Change Sponsor:	Land's End Airport Limited		
CAA Decision Document:	https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?pID=199		
CAA Decision Date:	12/08/2021	AIRAC Date(s):	07/10/2021
PIR Data Submission Requested:	02/07/2025	PIR Data Submission Required by:	ASAP (Delayed due COVID)

Introduction

1. The CAA's airspace change process is a seven-stage mechanism that is set out in detail in CAP 1616. Stage 7 of this process is a Post Implementation Review (PIR) that normally begins one year after implementation of the change. The PIR is an assessment of whether the anticipated impacts and benefits in the approved change and published decision are as expected and where there are differences, what steps (if any) the CAA requires to be taken.
2. Irrespective of whether the CAA decision to approve the change was made under the previous process (set out in CAP 725), all PIRs should normally be in accordance with the process requirements of CAP 1616. However, when assessing the expected impacts against the actual impacts, the methodology adopted at the time of the original CAA decision should be used.
3. Airspace Change Proposals can vary in size, scale and complexity, which has led the CAA to scale the PIR process appropriately. A PIR of Level 2 changes will be undertaken when it is proportionate to do so. For some changes, the CAA may proportionately reduce the extent of evidence and data required from the change sponsor or allow more flexibility in the format of the data required¹.
4. This data request form sets out that list of data required for the CAA to complete the assessment for a scaled PIR. On receipt of this data request form, the change sponsor should provide qualitative statements against each of the general observations listed below. The date on which the CAA requires the data to be submitted is stipulated at the top of this document.

¹ CAP 1616 – Para 294, 295 & Appendix H
APR-AC-TP-041

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

General Observations

1. The following general observations are to enable an overview of the effectiveness of the airspace change.
2. The change sponsor is required to submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
3. The CAA will review the analysis of the data submitted to ensure the anticipated impacts and benefits in the approved change were as expected.

- a) An overview statement on whether, in the change sponsor's view, the original proposal met the intended objectives as described on the CAA's decision to approve the change.

The purpose of this ACP was to consider possible airspace solutions that could provide mitigation to the current unknown traffic environment within the LETC. The ACP has mostly achieved this objective by the approval and implementation of a Radio Mandatory Zone (RMZ). The RMZ increases the safety of the airspace by creating a more informed traffic environment. In the future, the safety of the airspace could be further enhanced by some form of TMZ (perhaps an ADS-B Out TMZ in-conjunction with FID displays in the appropriate ATC Controlling Authorities ATCU's).

- b) An overview statement on whether, in the change sponsor's view, the original proposal met any conditions described on the CAA's decision to approve the change (if applicable).

The conditions imposed were:

Condition 1: The sponsor will be required to achieve ADQ compliance in the definition of the proposed LRMZ.

Condition 2: The sponsor will be required to gain regulatory approval of the proposed AIP Change Request for the notification of the LRMZ.

Condition 3: All required LoAs must be agreed and signed prior to the implementation of the proposed LRMZ.

The change sponsor achieved all three required conditions prior to the RMZ implementation.

- c) Confirm that implementation occurred on the dates identified in the Decision Letter. If no implementation date was specified in the Decision, please state so.

The Decision Letter stated that the "RMZ is approved for implementation as agreed through AIRAC 10/2021". There was a delay finalising the AIP data and implementation was achieved following AIRAC 11/2021 as evidenced by the NATS Aurora portal entry below:

CR-045 06	EGHC, EGHE, EGHK, EGHT - Land's End RMZ	ENDED	chris.pearson	ENDED	UK AIP	AIRAC AMDT	11/2021	2021-11-04	2021-11-04	PERM
--------------	---	-------	---------------	-------	--------	------------	---------	------------	------------	------

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

d) If there was a significant delay between the planned and actual implementation date, please provide an explanation.

No significant delay.

e) Identify whether any other issues of significance have occurred during the period 12 months after date of implementation.

No reported instances of unforeseen/unintentional operational impacts.

f) Other than normal promulgation activity (e.g. NOTAM, AIC etc.), identify what steps were undertaken to notify local aviation stakeholders that the airspace change was about to be implemented.

- i) Land's End Airport Website – promotion of the new RMZ
- ii) Email to local aviation organisations (Flying Clubs / Schools etc.)
- iii) Letter of Agreements with operators (Commercial Operators and GA including hang-gliders, etc.)
- iv) Email awareness and Letter of Agreements to and with local ATCU's
- v) AIP SUPPLEMENT 050/2021 highlighted changes

g) Feedback/complaints received from stakeholders, aviation stakeholders or the Ministry of Defence by the change sponsor in the period between implementation and post-implementation review (including feedback/complaints received via an FCS 1522 Form (UK Airspace Access or Refusal of ATS Report)).

Nil reports received.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Other information of relevance (if appropriate)

h) Information related to requests made by airspace users not equipped with radio to operate within the LRMZ:

Details of those requests that were approved and enabled to operate within the LRMZ.

Details of those requests that were not approved to operate within the LRMZ.

1. Details of those requests that were approved and enabled to operate within the LRMZ.

No requests from non-radio equipped aircraft to operate within the RMZ have been received.

2. Details of those requests that were not approved to operate within the LRMZ.

No requests from non-radio equipped aircraft to operate within the RMZ were declined.

i) Information related to any known incursions into the LRMZ by non-equipped or non-compliant airspace users.

2x Infringements of the RMZ by GA [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Both aircraft were compliant but did not call before entering the airspace. Subject to either SMS, MOR and/or CA939 action.

1x infringement of a group of three paramotors [REDACTED]. Departed Land's End geographic point and proceeded Eastbound through our ATZ and RMZ. MOR and CA939 action.

j) Additional information (as required)

Nil.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

For CAA use only

In providing a response for each general observation, please ensure that the 'status' column is completed using the following options and that they are colour coded accordingly:

YES • NO • PARTIALLY • N/A

A summary of any issues arising should be provided against each question in the appropriate text box.

General Observations	Status
a) Has the change sponsor indicated that the original proposal met the intended objectives as described on the CAA's decision to approve the change?	Yes
<p>The original ACP was to consider possible airspace solutions that could provide mitigation to the (as then) unknown traffic environment within the Lands End Transit Corridor (LETC). Four design options, of which two included a combined Radio Mandatory Zone (RMZ) and Transponder Mandatory Zone (TMZ), were considered. An RMZ alone was taken forward as the final design by the Sponsor as 'it best meets the needs of the design principles, regular airspace users, ATC and offers the most balanced and equitable solution to enhancing safety'. The introduction of this measure alone was considered sufficient to remove the element of unknown traffic operating within the area. The RMZ has created a known traffic environment (bar three infringements since its introduction in 2021) and has therefore met the intended objectives.</p> <p>A recent change to the CAA policy on TMZs now permits the use of alternate forms of electronic conspicuity data, such as ADS-B. In light of this change, the Sponsor considers that the safety of the airspace could be further enhanced by an ADS-B based TMZ. ACP 2023-006, Addition of an ADS-B TMZ to Lands End RMZ, is in progress with a planned submission date to the CAA in Oct 25.</p>	
b) Has the change sponsor indicated that the original proposal met any conditions described on the CAA's decision to approve the change (if applicable)?	Yes
There were three required conditions prior to the RMZ implementation; the sponsor met all three.	
c) Did the implementation occur on the date(s) identified in the Decision Letter?	No
There was a delay finalising the AIP data and implementation was achieved a month later than planned.	

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

General Observations	Status
d) Was there a significant delay between the planned and actual implementation date?	No
The Sponsor has not indicated that there was any impact as a result of the month's delay to implementation.	
e) Have there been any other issues of significance that occurred during the period 12 months after date of implementation?	No
f) Other than normal promulgation activity (e.g. NOTAM, AIC etc.), were there any steps undertaken to notify local aviation stakeholders that the airspace change was about to be implemented?	Yes
i) Land's End Airport Website – promotion of the new RMZ ii) Email to local aviation organisations (Flying Clubs / Schools etc.) iii) Letter of Agreements with operators (Commercial Operators and GA including hang-gliders, etc.) iv) Email awareness and Letter of Agreements to and with local ATCUs	
g) Were there any feedback/complaints received from stakeholders, aviation stakeholders or the Ministry of Defence by the change sponsor in the period between implementation and post-implementation review?	No
The sponsor has received no feedback or complaints from stakeholders.	

Other information of relevance (if appropriate)	Status
h) Details of those requests that were approved and enabled to operate within the LRMZ. Details of those requests that were not approved to operate within the LRMZ.	Yes
No requests from non-radio equipped aircraft to operate within the RMZ have been received and therefore there were no requests to decline.	
i) Information related to any known incursions into the LRMZ by non-equipped or non-compliant airspace users.	Yes
The sponsor reports three infringements since its implementation.	

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

General Summary and recommendation

Based on the above, does the CAA Project Officer recommend that this concludes the PIR assessment for this ACP?

Yes


This Stage 7 project has been categorised as a Scaled PIR. The RMZ has ensured a known and informed traffic environment and, since its establishment in 2021, there have been a small number of infringements. In addition, the sponsor has not received any complaints or feedback relating to the RMZ. For these reasons, I recommend that the airspace change has satisfactorily met the intended objective of the change.


Decision and Sign Off

Based on the above, does the Decision Maker conclude that the PIR assessment for this ACP complete?

Yes

We note that the change sponsor originally proposed a phased approach to amend the size and shape of the LRMZ, under the ACP. The CAA did not approve stage 2 or 3 of the proposal for the reason stated in the decision document (CAP2199, para 4.5). We confirm that the implemented design satisfactorily achieves the objective, and terms of the CAA's approval, within acceptable tolerance limits, and the airspace change is confirmed.

Signed: 

Name: 

Manager Airspace Regulation/Principal Airspace Regulator (delete as applicable)

Date: **03/09/2025**