

# CAP 1616 – Stage 1 ‘DEFINE’ Gateway

## Checklist of Requirements

<b>ACP Reference Number</b>	ACP-2024-028
<b>ACP Title</b>	Airspace to enable RPAS Calibration
<b>Change Sponsor</b>	Ministry of Defence
<b>Consultancy (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Approved Procedure Design Organisation (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Gateway Date</b>	30 January 2026

This checklist has been developed to ensure that Change Sponsors address relevant regulatory requirements when compiling their submissions to the CAA. Completion of this form does not in itself guarantee CAA approval. The CAA will review and assess the actual content of the Change Sponsor's submission, before making a regulatory decision on whether the relevant regulatory requirements have been addressed satisfactorily. Change Sponsors should refer to the contents of CAP 1616 and CAP 1616f for further guidance on the requirements listed below.

### Gateways

To help Change Sponsors and affected stakeholders track how a proposal is progressing and to give greater certainty that the Change Sponsor is following the process correctly, the CAA applies a series of three Gateway sign-offs during the seven-stage process. A sign-off provides the CAA's

approval that relevant process requirements and guidance have been correctly followed up to that point, and gives the Change Sponsor the CAA's approval to move to the next stage in the process. The purpose is to minimise any work having to be repeated, particularly in getting the supporting documentation for consultation right.

Passing a Gateway does not predetermine the CAA's later final decision on whether to accept the Airspace Change Proposal. Where the CAA is not satisfied that the relevant process requirements have been met, it is likely that the Change Sponsor would need to revisit the stage(s) concerned. It is entirely at the CAA's discretion whether to give approval for the Change Sponsor to move beyond the Gateway.

## Stage 1 'DEFINE' Gateway Requirements

Requirement		YES/N/A	Document/Section [Change Sponsor to signpost the relevant document/section]
1.	Have you provided a clear description of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objectives and intended outcomes</li> <li>• Airspace issues or opportunities</li> <li>• Current airspace design</li> <li>• History of any related previous airspace design changes</li> <li>• Current prevailing air traffic situation</li> <li>• Indication of estimated forecast traffic growth over a period of 10-years from the intended year of implementation</li> <li>• Potential area of impact, including any local urban and geographical features</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment Meeting Presentation (Portal)</li> <li>• Annex C – Current Day Scenario (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>
2.	Have you agreed a timeline detailing target dates for each Gateway, submission of the Formal Airspace Change Proposal and implementation with the CAA?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated Timeline – Agreed (Portal)</li> <li>• Para 4.2.1 (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>
3.	Have you provided a clear description of the Current-Day Scenario which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• airspace design: current structures, routes, flight procedures and flight behaviours/patterns</li> <li>• airspace usage survey and analysis: current airspace users, aircraft types, frequency/number of movements and typical altitudes</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annex C – Current Day Scenario (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• overflight and operational diagrams</li> <li>• operational efficiency, complexity, delays and choke points</li> <li>• any potential safety risks</li> <li>• local features below 7,000 feet: designated areas such as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA), National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), National Scenic Areas (NSA), designated Quiet Areas etc.</li> <li>• European sites overflown below 3,000 feet: Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and possible SACs, Special Protection Areas (SPA) and potential SPAs, Ramsar sites (wetlands of international importance) and proposed Ramsar sites; and compensatory habitat (areas secured to compensate for damage to SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites)</li> <li>• environmental impacts including current day noise and local air quality impacts on people, greenhouse gas emissions, tranquillity and biodiversity</li> <li>• local context: planning agreements, conditions and other relevant agreements (for example Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 agreements), noise action plans, Noise Preferential Routes or noise abatement procedures</li> </ul>		
4.	Have you developed a list of Design Principles to provide a framework against which Design Options can be developed and evaluated?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 2, Table 1 (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>
5.	Have you explained how the Design Principles were developed? (the use of Mandatory, Discretionary and/or Bespoke Design Principles and related stakeholder engagement)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 2.2 (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>
6.	Have you explained how local context and national policy were considered when developing the Design Principles?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 1.2 (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>
7.	Have you explained how local circumstances and competing priorities were considered when developing the Design Principles?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 2.3 (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>
8.	Do the Design Principles cover the criteria that will be used to inform the development of the Design Options, Initial Options Appraisal and Design Principle Evaluation?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 2.4.1 (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>
9.	Have you identified relevant stakeholders and considered their unique requirements?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3, Table 4 (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>
10.	Have you shared the Current-Day Scenario and Design Principles with relevant stakeholders and given them the opportunity to provide related feedback?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annex B (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annex C (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>
11.	Have you explained and provided a rationale for the engagement approach/methodology used throughout Stage 1?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3.1.1 onwards (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>
12.	Have you provided relevant engagement evidence (materials distributed, meeting/workshop presentations and minutes (where relevant), and copies of related correspondence)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table 5 (Submission Version 1)</li> <li>Appendix 1 – Raw Engagement Evidence</li> </ul>
13.	Have you demonstrated what you have heard and how this feedback has or has not informed the development of the Current-Day Scenario and Design Principles?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2.2 (Submission Version 1)</li> </ul>
14.	Have you demonstrated if the Airspace Change Proposal is aligned with the Airspace Modernisation Strategy (CAP 1711) and where applicable, the relevant iteration of the airspace change masterplan.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 16 (Appendix 1 – Raw Engagement Evidence)</li> </ul>
15.	Have you published the relevant Stage 1 ‘Define’ Gateway documents (redacted as appropriate) on the Airspace Change Portal?  If the proposal been given a provisional Level 1 status, has a potentially affected area been uploaded to the Airspace Change Portal? (CAP 2385)	Yes	Uploaded by 09/12/2025

Please provide any additional information below which is relevant to the Stage 1 ‘Define’ Gateway submission.

Two documents submitted 05/12/25 via Q-Share titled:

- ACP-2024-028 Stage One Submission Version 1**
- Appendix 1 – ACP\_2024-028 Raw Engagement Evidence v1**