

## CAA CAP 1616 Options Appraisal Assessment (Phase III Final)

<b>Title of Airspace Change Proposal:</b>	Northern LTMA Region Airspace Change (OFJES, CLN etc)		
<b>Change Sponsor:</b>	NATS		
<b>ACP Project Ref Number:</b>	ACP-2025-023		
<b>Case study commencement date:</b>	23/10/2025	<b>Case study report as at:</b>	16/12/2025

### Instructions

To aid the SARG project leader's efficient project management, please highlight the "status" cell for each question using one of the four colours to illustrate if it is:

Resolved - GREEN





Not Resolved – AMBER





















Not Compliant – RED

















Not Applicable - GREY

### Guidance

The broad principle of economic impact analysis is **proportionality**; is the level of analysis involved proportionate to the likely impact from that ACP. There are three broad levels of economic analysis; qualitative discussion, quantified through metrics, and monetised in £ terms. The more significant the impact, the greater should be the effort by sponsors to quantify and monetise the impact.

1. Background			Status
1.1	<p>Has the change sponsor developed the full options appraisal into a final options appraisal to consider any revised impacts due to the updated final design option and/or changes in data using the same approach as in the earlier stages?</p> <p>[CAP 1616f: 5.12-5.16]</p>	<p>This is a scaled ACP. The appraisal has been updated following consultation but is largely qualitative. However, it has been merely reproduced from the earlier stage rather than taking the opportunity to factor in feedback from consultation and engagement.</p> <p>Although, not appraised, option 0 (baseline) was discounted for not maintaining or improving levels of safety. Option 1 was discounted due to the impact upon</p>	   





		stakeholders and an assessment of the efficiency of airspace usage. These remain unchanged. The Sponsor argued the preferred option was taken forward largely due to safety considerations.	
1.2	Is the criteria and methodology used for analysing the impacts and the presentation of the information consistent with those adopted previously? [CAP 1616f: 5.13]	The method was simply to replicate the earlier appraisal. This meant taking account of the design principles and a qualitative methodology based upon sponsors judgement. These were consistent but at this stage, the qualitative judgement should at least demonstrate that it took account of the feedback informed it.	   
1.3	Has the change sponsor used the most up-to-date, credible, and clearly referenced sources of data with modelling carried out in line with relevant best practice? [CAP1616f: 5.14]	Some modelling work was used to help inform the qualitative judgements. This included radar trajectory density diagrams based upon data from May 2025 and 2023–2024 traffic statistics for Luton arrivals based upon NERL operational data. Responses from the Sponsor to CAA in relation to inquiries helped alleviate the necessity for traffic forecasts, in lieu of the safety considerations to manage the broader sector.	   
1.4	Is the source of data and reference material clear in the final options appraisal? [CAP 1616f: 5.16]	Yes	   
1.5	Has the change sponsor provided a rationale for any updates made to the final design option? [CAP 1616f: 5.17]	The change sponsor did not make any significant updates to the final design option	   
1.6	Has the change sponsor clearly described all the changes that have been made following the consultation and why they are required? [CAP 1616f: 5.17]	The change sponsor has not made any changes to the final design option following consultation	   

1.7	Has the change sponsor assessed whether any of the environmental impacts have changed? [CAP 1616f: 5.18-5.19]	The sponsor concluded that no significant changes in environmental impact would result from the proposed airspace change. Some stakeholders noted potential tranquillity impacts which result in complaints to the airport, but this wasn't reflected in the appraisal.	   
1.8	Has the change sponsor performed the environmental assessment and presented related information in a manner consistent with that used throughout the consultation process? [CAP 1616f: 5.19]	The change sponsor has performed the environmental assessment and presented related information in a manner consistent with that used throughout the consultation process, and in line with CAP1616 best practice for a scaled Level 2 airspace change proposal.	   
1.9	Has the change sponsor provided a final assessment of the impacts on safety? [CAP 1616f: 5.20-5.23]	<p>The rationale for this ACP was primarily due to safety impacts, which in turn led directly to the preferred option – focusing primarily on reducing air traffic controller workload. The documents state that the safety assurance will be completed prior to implementation.</p> <p>The information originally provided by the sponsor thus far does not help conclude the preferred option will mitigate future safety risks due to increasing complexity of traffic. Sponsor has since reverted to CAA inquiries with further information to help indicate the necessity of the preferred option as part of a safety mitigation approach</p>	   
1.10	Does the final safety assessment include: - A description of the scope of the proposed airspace change - Identification of the new and changing hazards - Identification and quantification of the risks arising from those hazards - Proposed mitigations to address the identified risks [CAP 1616f: 5.22]	The final safety assessment in ACP-2025-023 does partially address the expected components. The proposal clearly describes the change: a CAS boundary amendment involving Clacton CTA11 and CTA12, raising the base to FL105+ to improve ATC flexibility and reduce complexity. The ACP states the change is intended to mitigate future safety risks due to increasing traffic complexity and controller workload. But there is vague description in relation to the hazards. Sponsor has since reverted to CAA inquiries	   

		with further information to help indicate the necessity of the preferred option as part of a safety mitigation approach more in line with requirements with CAP 1616F. This helped identify maintaining and improving aviation safety as the key driver for this ACP.	
--	--	---	--

2. Potential Impacts					Status
2.1	Has the change sponsor conducted a final options appraisal of the proposed airspace change using the following metrics and level of analysis? [CAP 1616f: 5.12]				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
2.1.1	Communities	Not applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
	- Noise	x			
	- Local air quality	x			
2.1.2	Airport/ANSPs	Not applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
	- Infrastructure		x		
	- Operational		x		
	- Deployment		x		
	- Other(s)		x		
2.1.3	Commercial Airlines/General Aviation	Not applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
	- Training	x			
	- Increased effective capacity		x		
	- Fuel burn		x		
	- Other(s)	X			
2.1.4	General Aviation	Not applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised

	- Access		x		
	- Increased effective capacity		x		
	- Fuel burn	X			
2.1.5	Wider society	Not applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
	- Greenhouse gas emissions		x		
	- Tranquillity		x		
	- Biodiversity	X			
	- Capacity/resilience		x		
2.1.6	Military	Not applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
	-				
2.1.7	Other	Not applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
	-				

3. Economic Indicators			Status
3.1	<p>Has the change sponsor provided traffic forecasts for year 1 and year 10?</p> <p>[CAP 1616f: 3.22]</p>	<p>No specific forecast for Year 1 (2026) or Year 10 (2036). No modelling or projection tables showing expected traffic growth over time. This isn't required for a scaled ACP, but including traffic forecasts would have helped strengthen the safety case by showing that the preferred design can safely handle expected traffic levels by 2036. Sponsor responses to queries have helped assuage the need for traffic forecasts within the ACP area as the issue is in relation to the spread of traffic within the broader area.</p> <p>In the previous stage, the sponsor has taken account of updated data on airspace occupancy in this targeted bit of airspace to strengthen the evidence base for the</p>	   



		<p>qualitative assessments on other airspace users. It helpfully illustrates the magnitude of commercial flights that can benefit in the absence of forecast traffic data.</p> <p>Airspace occupancy data in the volume of airspace due to be amended under the preferred option was presented for the past 12 months. This showed this was nil general aviation traffic, and assessed the impacts on other airspace users as a result of the change. However, feedback indicates the preferred option anticipates integration of some forms of general aviation but it hasn't been reflected in the appraisal.</p>	
3.2	<p>Has the change sponsor valued all relevant costs and benefits of the proposed airspace change using:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Net present value (NPV)</li> <li>- Benefit cost ratio (BCR)</li> <li>- Cost benefit analysis (CBA)?</li> </ul> <p>[CAP 1616f: 3.43]</p>	The sponsor did not monetise the impacts	
3.3	<p>When appraising costs and benefits of the proposed airspace change, has the change sponsor assessed them incrementally against the baseline scenarios?</p> <p>[CAP 1616f: 3.45]</p>	The sponsor did not monetise the impacts. However, where there was a change in the impact, it was generally assessed with reference to option 0.	
3.4	<p>Has the change sponsor expressed the values derived for the costs and benefits set out above in 'real' rather than 'nominal' terms?</p> <p>[CAP 1616f: 3.46]</p>	The sponsor did not monetise the impacts	
3.5	<p>Have values been reported in the base year for the assessment?</p> <p>[CAP 1616f: 3.47]</p>	The sponsor did not monetise the impacts	

3.6	As well as taking account of inflation in real prices, has the change sponsor used a social time preference rate? [CAP 1616f: 3.48]	The sponsor did not monetise the impacts nor quantify them	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--	--	--

4. Summary of the Final Options Appraisal			
4.1	What are the qualitative/strategic impacts of the proposed airspace change?	<p>The key qualitative impacts in this ACP are the impacts upon other airspace users for whom access will be reduced (e.g. military/general aviation).</p> <p>However, this would be traded off against increased safety, improved capacity/resilience and consequential net benefits upon air traffic controllers and fuel burn/emissions by commercial airlines</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
4.2	What are the overall non-monetised (quantified) impacts of the proposed airspace change?	None of the impacts have been quantified due to proportionality.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
4.3	Where impacts have been monetised, what is the overall net present value (NPV) of the proposed airspace change?	The impacts were not monetised	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
4.4	<p>Has the change sponsor used the economic assessment to progress/discontinue design options and support the choice of the proposed airspace change?</p> <p>If the proposed airspace change does not have the highest NPV or benefit cost ratio (BCR), then has the change sponsor justified the reasons to progress this airspace change?</p>	The sponsor has used the appraisal as part of the rationale to discontinue the status quo as a potential option. The preferred design option benefitted from stakeholder support through early engagement ahead of consultation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

5. Other Aspects	
5.1	N/A

## 6. Conclusions

6.1

The preferred option of this ACP has been largely designed in relation to maintaining or enhancing levels of aviation safety. Sponsor has provided information to substantiate the need for this approach. The appraisal allowed for consultation of an alternative approach which was tested with stakeholders alongside the preferred option. At this stage, the preferred option was chosen with stakeholder support and re-appraised with fresh traffic data. None of the impacts were monetised so the appraisal was largely qualitative with limited impact upon the environment. Impacts upon other aviation stakeholders were largely limited in the preferred option aside from potential fuel efficiencies from descents in additional flight levels. Sponsor responded to CAA inquiries to help identify the key impact upon air navigation service providers from the baseline options and thus justify the preferred option to be taken forward. The safety driver behind the ACP helped mitigate the need for further appraisal work including the usefulness of 10-year traffic forecasts for the ACP area. Information was provided on current day scenario which was updated and sufficient to identify there would be limited impact upon other aviation stakeholders like general aviation. This was then confirmed through consultation.

CAA Final Options Appraisal Completed by	Name	Signature	Date
Airspace Regulator (Economist)			18/11/2025