

DDP ref.	DPD (Section 11 of the submission)	Internal shortlisting meeting (Section 12 of the submission)	Internal review after the shortlisting meeting, prior to recall workshops (Section 13 of the submission)	PDP ref	Changes suggested at recall workshop 1 (Section 17.2 of the submission)	Changes suggested at recall workshop 2 (Section 17.2 of the submission)	FDP wording (Section 17.5 of the submission)	FDP ref						
							Collaborate with other Scottish airports and NATS to ensure that the airspace design options are compatible with the wider programme of lower altitude and network airspace changes being coordinated by the FASI North programme.	6						
2	"Fly over the sea/fly down the Forth"	Accepted for further discussion	Based on the discussion, a new DP was added - "Evaluate dispersal for mitigation purposes".  The three existing DPs were merged into a new DP - "Minimise the total adverse impact of aircraft noise (41/51 dba Laeq)".  It was decided that this DP will be considered as part of the DP on minimising adverse effects of noise.  This DP was moved to the noise section.	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should be designed to evaluate dispersal for mitigation purposes"	New wording was proposed as a result of feedback from the wider project team - "Where possible, flight paths should be designed to include track concentration and/or track dispersal options to provide noise respite."	Wording of this DP remained unchanged	Flight paths should be designed to include track concentration and/or track dispersal options to provide noise respite.	11						
5	"Reduce flights over communities/fly over less populated areas"	Accepted for further discussion												
9	"Do not fly over currently unaffected areas in planning"	Accepted for further discussion												
19	"Avoid over flying rural areas"	Accepted for further discussion												
28	"Do not concentrate flight paths"	Accepted for further discussion												
43	"Concentrate flight paths during work hours"	Accepted for further discussion												
1	"Reduce night flights and early morning flights"	Accepted for further discussion	The two DPs about aircraft noise impact were merged into a single DP - "Minimise the total adverse impact of aircraft noise."	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures must be designed to minimise the total adverse impact of aircraft noise below 7,000ft"	As a result of feedback from the wider project team, these two DPs were merged and reworded to "Flight paths should be designed to minimise the total adverse effect on health and quality of life impacts created by aircraft noise and emissions."	Wording of this DP remained unchanged	Flight paths should be designed to minimise the total adverse effect on health and quality of life created by aircraft noise and emissions.	7						
34	"Ensure true accessibility in design"	Accepted for further discussion												
6	"Minimise noise"	Accepted for further discussion												
15	"Consider noise from take-off/ landing/turning"	Accepted for further discussion												
16	"Take background noise into account"	Accepted for further discussion												
18	"Minimise noise/flights below 7,000ft"	Accepted for further discussion, only on the basis of "minimise noise". Minimising flights is against programme aims and that aspect was rejected.	It was decided that we would create a general DP about impact of noise under 7,000ft. Wording to be discussed.	Wording decided as - "Minimise the total adverse impact of aircraft noise below 7,000ft".										
24	"Restrict aircraft turning over communities"	Accepted for further discussion												
14	"Consider impact on mental health/wellbeing"	Accepted for further discussion	The three DPs in this group were merged into a new DP - "Minimise health impacts created by aircraft."	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should be designed to minimise health impacts created by aircraft noise and emissions"		Wording of this DP remained unchanged	Flight paths should be designed to minimise the total adverse effect on health and quality of life created by aircraft noise and emissions.	7						
21	"Consider other health impacts"	Accepted for further discussion												
30	"Consider impact on sleep"	Accepted for further discussion												
35	"Minimise route deviations"	Accepted for further discussion	It was decided that this DP would be reworded to - "Maximise the predictability of the track flow".	This DP was reworded to "Maximise the predictability of the track designed/flow".	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should be designed to maximise predictability of the track design for consistency of operations."	As a result of feedback from the wider project team this DP was reworded to "The predictability of flight tracks must be maximised for consistency of operations."	The wording of this DP remained unchanged	"The predictability of flight tracks must be maximised for consistency of operations."	14	Add "we will work with air traffic control to keep these flight paths as narrow as possible."	No changes suggested.	The predictability of flight tracks must be maximised for consistency of operations.	5	
8	"Avoid overflying of schools"	Accepted for further discussion	It was decided that a DP stating that we would consider noise-sensitive locations would be created. Wording to be discussed.	Wording was decided as "Consider the impact on protected species and noise sensitive receptors, subject to HRA".	The DP on noise impacts was divided into three, based on the three themes in the previous wording:  "Minimise population overflight, taking into account protected characteristics"  "Minimise overflying sensitive locations"  "Consider the impact on protected species and noise sensitive receptors subject to HRA."	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should be designed to minimise population overflight, taking into account protected characteristics."	As a result of feedback from the wider project team this DP was reworded to "Flight paths should be designed to minimise population overflight below 4,000ft and, where possible, below 7,000ft, taking into account protected characteristics as defined by Equalities Act 2010"	As a result of further feedback from the wider project team this DP was reworded to "Flight paths should be designed to minimise population overflight below 4,000ft and, where possible, between 4,000ft and 7,000ft, taking into account any potential adverse impact, due to those overflight having protected characteristics, as defined by the Equalities Act 2010."	11	Remove "where possible".  Change "taken into account" with "meet the requirements of communities defined as having protected characteristics".  Explain "protected characteristics".  Recognise adverse effects from noise above 7,000ft, up to 12,000ft.	Provide further explanation on what this means.	Flight paths should be designed to minimise population overflight below 4,000ft and, between 4,000ft and 7,000ft, taking into account any potential adverse impact, due to those overflight having protected characteristics, as defined by the Equalities Act 2010.	9	
17	"Consider and offset the impact on wildlife and the environment"	Accepted for further discussion												
22	"Consider needs of the elderly/ children/those with ill health/autism/sensory impairment"	Accepted for further discussion												
25	"Avoid overflying hospitals and care/retirement homes"	Accepted for further discussion												
29	"Avoid overflying of historical sites"	Accepted for further discussion												
41	"Consider impact on animal welfare"	Accepted for further discussion												
45	"Reduce impact on green spaces"	Accepted for further discussion												
46	"Avoid flying over the zoo"	Accepted for further discussion												
11	"Ensure consideration of all airspace users"	Accepted for further discussion	It was decided that the two DPs would be merged into one -	This DP was reworded to "Prioritise the requirements of"	This DP was reworded to "Balance the needs of all"	This DP was reworded to "Consider the needs of all"	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures must be designed"	As a result of feedback from the wider project team this DP was reworded to "The prioritised requirements of"	The wording of this DP remained unchanged	7	Explain what "airspace users" are.  Re-write in a less jargonistic way.	Removal of "the prioritised" agreed.  Change from "must" to "should"	Requirements of airspace users should be taken into account	14

40	"Ensure access to airspace by general aviation"	Accepted for further discussion	"Ensure consideration of all airspace users"	Minimise the requirements of all airspace users"	Balance the needs of all airspace users"	Consider the needs of all airspace users"	Procedures must be designed to prioritise the requirements of all airspace users."	The proposed requirements of airspace users must be taken into account when designing flight paths."	airspace users must be taken into account when designing flight paths."	4	Change from "must" to "should". Remove "the prioritised".	agreed. Look into releasing airspace for GA.	airspace users must be taken into account when designing flight paths."	27							
12	"Ensure fully integrated airspace change"	Accepted for further discussion	It was decided that the four DPs would be merged into one - "Consider amending routes to optimise the existing airspace".	Following a discussion, this DP was rejected.																	
31	"Redesign the terminal airspace"	Accepted for further discussion																			
48	"Take into account segregation of different plane types (e.g. turbo jet and prop)"	Accepted for further discussion																			
51	"Routes to and from Glasgow and Edinburgh should be procedurally deconflicted from the ground to Flight Level 90" (Requested by the Glasgow Airport)	Accepted for further discussion												As a result of an email from Glasgow Airport (Appendix C), this DP was re-instated "Routes to and from Glasgow and Edinburgh should be procedurally deconflicted from the ground to Flight Level 90"	16	Explain "procedurally deconflicted".	No changes suggested.	Routes to/from Glasgow and Edinburgh airports must be procedurally deconflicted from the ground to a preferred level in coordination with NATS Prestwick.	4		
7	"Reduce emissions/pollution"	Accepted for further discussion	It was decided that the three DPs would be rewritten into two DPs - "Optimise routes to minimise emissions" and "Optimise routes to improve air quality"	The DP about minimising emissions was reworded to "Contribute to the SG Climate Change agenda by optimising flight paths to minimise CO2 emissions."	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should be designed to contribute to the Scottish Government Climate Change agenda by optimising flight paths to minimise CO2 emissions."	As a result of feedback from the wider project team this DP was reworded to "Flight paths should be designed to minimise CO2 emissions above an altitude of 7,000ft and, where it doesn't have a detrimental effect on adverse noise impacts, also between 4,000ft and 7,000ft."	The wording of this DP remained unchanged "Flight paths should be designed to minimise CO2 emissions above an altitude of 7,000ft and, where it doesn't have a detrimental effect on adverse noise impacts, also between 4,000ft and 7,000ft."	6	Revert to ANG 2017 wording.	Reversal to ANG 2017 wording agreed.	For flightpaths at or above 4,000ft to below 7,000ft, the environmental priority should continue to be minimising the impact of aviation noise in a manner consistent with the government's overall policy on aviation noise, unless this would disproportionately increase CO2 emissions.	8									
39	"Consider climate impact"	Accepted for further discussion											The DP about air quality was reworded to "Optimise flight paths to minimise local air quality impacts"	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should be designed to optimise flight paths to minimise local air quality impact."	As a result of feedback from the wider project team this DP was reworded to "Flight paths should be designed to minimise adverse local air quality impacts."	The wording of this DP remained unchanged "Flight paths should be designed to minimise adverse local air quality impacts."	7	Change "should" to "must". Include "local communities of people" to clarify priority of people over animals etc. Include "global", not just "local".	Merge with DPD 4 and make the resulting DP a "must". Caution urged over deletion as the community may interpret this as not caring about local air quality impacts.	Flight paths should be designed to minimise adverse local air quality impacts.	15
49	"Make routes as short as possible"	Accepted for further discussion											After a discussion, a new DP was added to complement the other two in the group - "Design cost efficient routes to minimise track miles and fuel burn."	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should design cost effective routes to minimise track miles and fuel burn."	As a result of feedback from the wider project team this DP was reworded to "Flight paths should be designed with cost effective routes that minimise track miles and fuel burn."	The wording of this DP remained unchanged "Flight paths should be designed with cost effective routes that minimise track miles and fuel burn."	8	Remove words "cost-effective".	Removal of "cost-effective" agreed.	Flight paths should be designed with routes that minimise track miles and fuel burn.	12
26	"Review need for growth"	Accepted for further discussion	It was decided that these two DPs would be rewritten into - "Support growth in line with SG Economic Development" and that another DP on the aims of the SON to be added later.	The wording of this DP was expanded to "Support growth in line with Scottish Government Economic Development."	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should be designed to support growth in line with Scottish Government Economic Development."	As a result of feedback from the wider project team these three DPs were merged and reworded to "Flight paths should be designed to provide increased airspace capacity to support Edinburgh Airport's growth and modernisation strategy in line with the Scottish Government's Economic Development agenda."	As a result of further feedback from the wider project team, this DP was reworded to "Flight paths should be designed to provide increased airspace capacity in order for Edinburgh Airport to support the Scottish Government's Economic Development agenda and the UK's wider aviation strategy."	5	Remove it completely. Include reference to tourism and trade.	Inclusion of tourism and trade agreed.	Airspace should be designed to maximise capacity in order to contribute economic benefits to Scotland, including tourism.	16									
33	"Ensure consideration of wider tourism impacts"	Rejected - out of scope, tourism added to issues to consider											The wording of the DP on SON aims remained undecided.	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should be designed in line with Edinburgh Airport's growth and modernisation strategy"	Following a discussion, it was decided to add another DP "Create an airspace that does not constrain growth"	This DP was reworded to "Enable increased airspace capacity"	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should be designed to enable increased airspace capacity"				
27	"Prioritise safety"	Accepted for further discussion	It was decided that these two DPs would be merged into a new DP - "The airspace design and its operation must be as safe or safer than today".	The wording of this DP remained unchanged "The airspace design and its operation must be as safe or safer than today"	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "The airspace design and its operation must be as safe or safer than today."	As a result of feedback from the wider project team this DP was reworded to "The airspace design and its operation must be as safe or safer than it is today."	The wording of this DP remained unchanged "The airspace design and its operation must be as safe or safer than it is today."	1	No changes suggested.	No changes suggested.	The airspace design and its operation must be as safe or safer than it is today.	1									
52	"The airspace design and its operation must be as safe or safer than today" (requested by NATS/NERL)	Accepted for further discussion																			
36	"Consider no change to flight paths"	Accepted for further discussion	This DP was reworded to "Consider clean sheet approach to ACP."	Reworded "Consider a "blank page" approach to ACP"	This DP was moved to "overall approaches for airspace design", and rejected as a DP.	As a result of a discussion on the blank page approach, a new DP was added "Options considered shall be safe and feasible"	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures must be designed to be technically flyable."	As a result of feedback from the wider project team this DP was reworded to "Flight paths must be flyable."	The wording of this DP remained unchanged "Flight paths must be flyable."	3	No changes suggested.	Provide further explanation on what this means.	Flight paths must be flyable and technically supported by air traffic control and airport technical management systems.	2							
						As a result of a discussion on the blank page approach, a new DP was added "Routes will only accommodate PBN capable traffic after xx years."	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should be designed to only accommodate PBN capable traffic after xx years."	As a result of feedback from the wider project team, this DP was reworded to "Flight paths must be designed to accommodate PBN traffic in line with CAA's modernisation strategy."	10	Provide explanation on "PBN" and "CAA's modernisation strategy." Merge with DPDs 8 and 9.	Expanding "PBN" to "performance-based navigation" agreed. Clarify PBN as "higher standard" or "modern".	Flight paths must be designed to allow modern aircraft to use performance-based navigation (PBN) in line with CAA's modernisation strategy	3								
						Based on the discussion about the clean sheet approach, a new DP was added "Design routes to ensure an effective route management"	This DP remained unchanged "Design routes to ensure an effective route management"	New wording was tested with the wider project team - "Procedures should be designed to ensure an efficient and effective route management."	Wording of this DP remained unchanged "Procedures should be designed to ensure efficient and effective route management."	As a result of further feedback from the wider project team, this DP was reworded to "Flight paths should be designed to ensure efficient and effective route management."	9	Provide further explanation on what this means.	No changes suggested.	Flight paths should be designed to ensure efficient and effective route management.	13						

			After a discussion, it was decided that another DP will be added to consideration "Consider replicating existing routes"	This DP was rejected as it was felt it would restrict our thinking.
3	"Consider impact of aircraft type/penalise poor performers/old aircraft"	Accepted for further discussion	Moved to operational matters to be considered separate to the DPs	
4	"Ensure decision making is evidence based (and evidence is appropriate/high quality)"	Rejected as out of scope for the programme, added to issues to consider		
10	"Adhere to WHO regulations"	Rejected as not a requirement in the UK	We will aim to meet the CAP1616 requirements	
13	"Restrict aircraft holding areas over communities"	Rejected as out of scope		
20	"Offset emissions"	Rejected as not an issue of airspace design.	This will be considered as part of our sustainability strategy	
23	"Recognise impact of flight paths on house prices and social migration"	Accepted for further discussion	Rejected after further discussion - matter for PIR.	
32	"Reduce flights"	Rejected as against programme aims		
37	"Take account of noise above 7,000ft"	Rejected as out of scope, terrain added to issues to consider	Action to amend a DP removed.	
38	"Minimise light pollution"	Rejected as contrary to safety standards		
42	"Considerations for specific routes"	Rejected as operational issue, not an issue of design		
44	"Review routes/flight corridors"	Accepted for further discussion	Agreed that this is the purpose of the ACP process. Rejected as not a design principle	
47	"Make take off/landing gradients steeper"	Rejected as not feasible.		
50	"Fly the west side of the River Almond"	Rejected as contrary to safety standards		