

Attendees

Airspace Regulation (AR)

Principal Airspace Regulator (Engagement & Consultation)
Principal Airspace Regulator (IFP)
Airspace Regulator (Economist)
Airspace Regulator (Technical)
Airspace Regulatory (Environment)

Airspace Classification (AC)

Team Principal
Airspace Lead
Airspace Analyst

Actions

- 1. AC to liaise with AR to establish correct naming ID for the proposed airspace change**
- 2. AC to publish amended Requirements Statement, proposed timelines and kick-off meeting presentation and meeting notes**
- 3. AC to confirm a point of contact for the proposed airspace change**
- 4. AR to discuss internally how AC submissions will be prioritised alongside CAP 1616 workload.**

Introduction and Summary of process and requirements

Introductions and overview of roles and responsibilities.

The relevant wording of the joint Memorandum of Understanding was shared to remind attendees of the purpose of the touchpoint sessions, and this Amend kick off session in particular, which is to keep AR informed of the activity carried out by AC in its review work leading up to final submission, and for AR to ensure that AC is kept aware of any information pertinent to airspace change activity within the region of focus.

It was emphasized that AR will not give any indication, through these touchpoints, as to whether it will accept the final submission, that all relevant information will be made public so as to ensure that there is no perception of regulatory bias during the process.

Cotswold Region Review Summary

A short summary of the CAP 1991 process was given, followed by an overview of the AC team's investigation into airspace usage within the Cotswold region to date, highlighting findings and recommendations beyond changes to airspace classification.

AC announced that the volume being taken through to the amend phase of the CAP 1991 process is Daventry CTA 6. It was stressed that this does not mean that the airspace will definitely be amended, but that further detailed work would now be required, working alongside the airspace change authority, NERL, to identify potential solutions, and to consult on these publicly before an amendment submission is made.

A Draft Requirements Statement was presented to AR and several amendments have been suggested as actions (establishment of correct airspace change ID and determining a point of contact for the proposed change). The final Requirements Statement will be published on the team webpage, along with the agenda, presentation, and meeting notes.

A preliminary timeline was discussed, and it was acknowledged that the timeline is highly dependent on access to NERL resource and, as such, is difficult to confirm. AR emphasised the need for a draft timeline to help them plan their own resourcing to support this process. AR noted that CAP 1616 process timelines refer only to expected dates by which sponsors may seek CAP 1616 Gateway meetings. While CAP 1991 does not have such formal gateways, the AC timeline should instead aim to reflect the key touchpoint dates in the AC process, including expected consultation dates, the proposed date of final airspace change submission, a date when AR is expected to have made its decision and the date when AIRAC would need to be updated. **Action AC** team to update requirement Statement accordingly.

Assessment requirements

Given this was the inaugural amend kick off session for the AC and AR teams, clarity was sought by AC from the subject matter experts in AR on the expected decision requirements and degree of evidence required in the final submission, as well as the potential means of presenting this information in the final submission.

AR's specialists discussed the CAP 1616 requirements and highlighted the key differences between CAP 1616 and CAP 1991 assessment processes:

- **Economic Assessment:** Economic expert suggested that CAP 1991 airspace change is not likely to have any significant economic impact due to limited environmental impact hence cost benefit analysis should not be necessary.
- **Environmental Assessment:** Environmental expert mentioned that the environmental impact assessment (noise, CO₂ emissions, local air quality, tranquillity and biodiversity) should include a baseline reflecting the current use of airspace alongside the assessment of each proposed design option against this baseline. If quantitative environmental assessments cannot be undertaken (as signposted in CAP1991) the rationale for this should be explained along with supporting evidence. The team should undertake a robust qualitative assessment instead if this is the case. They emphasised the importance of consultation with local communities and consideration of the needs of all stakeholders in this assessment.
- **IFP implications:** IFP expert stated that although the current proposed AC airspace change (Davenport CTA 6) does not have any IFP implications, future airspace changes sponsored by AC could result in changes to IFP so the process should be developed as the evaluation required in that case would incur significant cost. AC team agreed that such possibility remains for future changes, however, considering the limited resources of AC team, and the filters set out in our CAP, any airspace change resulting in IFP changes is very unlikely to be progressed under CAP 1991.
- **Operational Assessment:** Technical expert agreed that the operational assessment for any change under the CAP 1991 process should be a scaled version of that required under the CAP 1616 requirements. He suggested referring to the CAP 1616 operational assessment template as a guide and excluding parts which may be irrelevant to CAP.
- **Consultation Assessment:** the engagement and consultation expert explained that the template used to review and assess consultations for CAP1616 airspace change proposals would be suitable to support the CAP1991 decision making process. They also provided a brief summary of key consultation principles and best practice.

Next steps

Following a request from AC regarding how AR will prioritise any submission against the existing CAP 1616 ACP workloads, it was agreed that AR will provide an update to AC in due course. Action AR to discuss internal prioritisation of CAP 1991

AC will update its Requirements Statement and publish it together with proposed timelines and Amend Kick-off meeting presentation material and minutes.