

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Page 1 of 13

Airspace Change Proposal - Operational Assessment

Version: 1.0/ 2016

Title of Airspace Change Proposal	EG D113 – change to ASM process
Change Sponsor	NATS
SARG Project Leader	[REDACTED]
Case Study commencement date	14 March 2014
Case Study report as at	
File Reference	20170314 - Change to ASM process for EG D113A/B and EG D115A/B

Instructions

In providing a response for each question, please ensure that the 'Status' column is completed using the following options:

- **Yes**
- **No**
- **Partially**
- **N/A**

To aid the SARG Project Leader's efficient Project Management it may be useful that each question is also highlighted accordingly to illustrate what is:

resolved  **not resolved**  **not compliant**  as part of the AR Project Leader's efficient project management.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

1.	Justification for change and “Option Analysis”	Status
1.1	<p>Is the explanation of the proposed change clear and understood?</p> <p>The NATS proposal to activate EG D113A/B and EG D115A/B by NOTAM rather than the times and vertical extent defined in the AIP ENR 5.1 is clear and in keeping with FUA and ASM policy.</p>	YES
1.2	<p>Are the reasons for the change stated and acceptable?</p> <p>The reasons are clear as stated above, and are acceptable aims that are in line with CAA policies for improving airspace efficiency.</p>	YES
1.3	<p>Have all appropriate alternative options been considered, including the ‘do nothing’ option?</p> <p>Yes, the do nothing option would unnecessarily segregate airspace when the range was not in use.</p>	YES
1.4	<p>Is the justification for the selection of the proposed option sound and acceptable?</p> <p>The justification is made primarily on the grounds of providing greater access to CDRs that route through the range and for Class G airspace users. This is acceptable and through seeking to do this, no negative impacts have been identified in other related areas.</p>	YES

2.	Airspace Description and Operational Arrangements	Status
2.1	<p>Is the type of proposed airspace clearly stated and understood?</p> <p>Yes, there is no change to the airspace, just the method of danger area activation.</p>	YES
2.2	<p>Are the hours of operation of the airspace and any seasonal variations stated and acceptable?</p> <p>The danger area is currently published as active for set periods regardless of whether any activity that requires segregated airspace is being conducted or not. Additionally, the AIP ENR 5.1 states that the range can be activated outside of the published hours by NOTAM. Therefore the net result will be a reduction in the hours of activation; this will benefit both GAT wishing to utilise the associated CDRs and the GA community who fly in the vicinity of the range.</p>	YES

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

2.3	Is any interaction with adjacent domestic and international airspace structures stated and acceptable including an explanation of how connectivity is to be achieved? Has the agreement of adjacent States been secured in respect of High Seas airspace changes?	N/A
	N/A	
2.4	Is the supporting statistical evidence relevant and acceptable?	N/A
	N/A	
2.5	Is the analysis of the impact of the traffic mix on complexity and workload of operations complete and satisfactory?	YES
	Yes, as stated above the impact will provide greater access to Class G airspace for the GA community and CDR amiability for GAT.	
2.6	Are any draft Letters of Agreement and/ or Memoranda of Understanding included and, if so, do they contain the commitments to resolve ATS procedures (ATSD) and airspace management requirements?	YES
	Yes.	
2.7	Should there be any other aviation activity (low flying, gliding, parachuting, microlight site etc) in the vicinity of the new airspace structure and no suitable operating agreements or ATC Procedures can be devised, what action has the sponsor carried out to resolve any conflicting interests?	N/A
	No such activities to affect.	
2.8	Is the evidence that the Airspace Design is compliant with ICAO SARPs, Airspace Design & FUA regulations, and Eurocontrol Guidance satisfactory?	N/A
	N/A - No change to the airspace design.	
2.9	Is the proposed airspace classification stated and justification for that classification acceptable?	N/A
	N/A – No change to the airspace classification.	
2.10	Within the constraints of safety and efficiency, does the airspace classification permit access to as many classes of	YES

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

	user as practicable?	YES
	Yes – greater access to GAT and GA.	
2.11	Is there assurance, as far as practicable, against unauthorised incursions? (This is usually done through the classification and promulgation)	YES
	Yes – Range activity will be promulgated by NOTAM and AUP/UUP.	
2.12	Is there a commitment to allow access to all airspace users seeking a transit through controlled airspace as per the classification, or in the event of such a request being denied, a service around the affected area?	YES
	Yes - no change to DACS.	
2.13	Are appropriate arrangements for transiting aircraft in place in accordance with stated commitments?	YES
	Yes - no change.	
2.14	Are any airspace user group's requirements not met?	NO
	No.	
2.15	Is any delegation of ATS justified and acceptable? (If yes, refer to Delegated ATS Procedure).	YES
	Yes - no change.	
2.16	Is the airspace structure of sufficient dimensions with regard to expected aircraft navigation performance and manoeuvrability to contain horizontal and vertical flight activity (including holding patterns) and associated protected areas in both radar and non-radar environments?	YES
	Yes – no change to the danger area dimensions.	

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

2.17	Have all safety buffer requirements (or mitigation of these) been identified and described satisfactorily (to be in accordance with the agreed parameters or show acceptable mitigation)? (Refer to buffer policy letter).	YES
	Yes – no change.	
2.18	Do ATC procedures ensure the maintenance of prescribed separation between traffic inside a new airspace structure and traffic within existing adjacent or other new airspace structures?	YES
	Yes – no change.	
2.19	Is the airspace structure designed to ensure that adequate and appropriate terrain clearance can be readily applied within and adjacent to the proposed airspace?	N/A
	N/A	
2.20	If the new structure lies close to another airspace structure or overlaps an associated airspace structure, have appropriate operating arrangements been agreed?	N/A
	N/A	
2.21	Where terminal and en-route structures adjoin, is the effective integration of departure and arrival routes achieved?	N/A
	N/A	

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

3.	Supporting Resources and CNS Infrastructure	Status
3.1	<p>Is the evidence of supporting CNS infrastructure together with availability and contingency procedures complete and acceptable? The following are to be satisfied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communication: Is the evidence of communications infrastructure including RT coverage together with availability and contingency procedures complete and acceptable? Has this frequency been agreed with AAA Infrastructure? 	YES
	<p>Already in place and no changes as a result of this proposal.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Navigation: Is there sufficient accurate navigational guidance based on in-line VOR or NDB or by approved RNAV derived sources, to contain the aircraft within the route to the published RNP value in accordance with ICAO/ Eurocontrol Standards? Eg. Nav aids – has coverage assessment been made eg. a DEMETER report, and if so, is it satisfactory? 	YES
	<p>No change.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Surveillance: Radar Provision – have radar diagrams been provided, and do they show that the ATS route / airspace structure can be supported? 	YES
	<p>No change.</p>	
3.2	<p>Where appropriate, are there any indications of the resources to be applied, or a commitment to provide them, in line with current forecast traffic growths acceptable?</p>	YES
	<p>Yes – The Military Airspace Manager has confirmed that the MABCC have the capacity to manage EG D113A/B and EG D115A/B on behalf of the MOD.</p>	

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

4.	Maps/Charts/Diagrams	Status
4.1	<p>Is a diagram of the proposed airspace included in the proposal, clearly showing the dimensions and WGS84 coordinates? (We would expect sponsors to include clear maps and diagrams of the proposed airspace structure(s) – they do not have to accord with AC&D aeronautical cartographical standards (see CAP725), rather they should be clear and unambiguous and reflect precisely the narrative descriptions of the proposals. AC&D work would relate to regulatory consultation charts only).</p> <p>N/A – no change.</p>	N/A
4.2	<p>Do the charts clearly indicate the proposed airspace change?</p> <p>N/A – no change.</p>	N/A
4.3	<p>Has the Change Sponsor identified AIP pages affected by the Change Proposal and provided a draft amendment?</p> <p>Yes.</p>	YES

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

5.	Operational Impact	Status
5.1	<p>Is the Change Sponsor's analysis of the impact of the change on all airspace users, airfields and traffic levels, and evidence of mitigation of the effects of the change on any of these, complete and satisfactory? Consideration should be given to:</p> <p>a) Impact on IFR GAT, on OAT or on VFR general aviation traffic flow in or through the area.</p> <p>Yes, the proposal will provide greater access to other airspace users when the danger areas are not being used.</p> <p>b) Impact on VFR Routes.</p> <p>No specific routes are affected, but GA will be afforded greater access to the airspace when the ranges are not being used.</p> <p>c) Consequential effects on procedures and capacity, ie on SIDS, STARS, holds. Details of existing or planned routes and holds.</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>d) Impact on Airfields and other specific activities within or adjacent to the proposed airspace.</p> <p>Nil.</p> <p>e) Any flight planning restrictions and/ or route requirements.</p> <p>Activating EG D113A/B and EG D115A/B by NOTAM will increase the opportunity for GAT to flight plan along the associated CDRs.</p>	<p align="center">YES</p> <p align="center">YES</p> <p align="center">N/A</p> <p align="center">Nil</p> <p align="center">YES</p>
5.2	<p>Does the Change Sponsor Consultation letter reflect the likely operational impact of the change?</p> <p>N/A – no consultation required. Prior to submitting the proposal the Sponsor consulted with the MOD who is the only stakeholder impacted by the proposed change. The MOD has stated that they are content to manage EG D113A/B and EG D115A/B by NOTAM.</p>	<p align="center">N/A</p>

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

6.	Economic Impact	Status
6.1	<p>Is a provisional economic impact assessment to all categories of operations and users likely to be affected by the change included and acceptable? (This may include any forecast capacity gains and the cost of any resultant additional track mileage).</p> <p>The economic impact of the proposal is positive in that it will reduce track miles when the associated CDRs are available for flight planning and/or tactical ATM re-routing. The ability to utilise the airspace without coordination with the range when the danger areas are notified as not active will also positively impact ATM capacity.</p>	YES

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Case Study Conclusions – To be completed by SARG Project Leader	Yes/No
Has the Change Sponsor met the SARG Airspace Change Proposal requirements and Airspace Regulatory requirements above?	YES
<p>The Sponsor has provided an adequate proposal that fully articulates the proposed change. All consultation materials have been reviewed and no apparent issues have arisen.</p> <p>This proposal improves the availability of GA aircraft transiting the impacted area and will increase the availability of associated CDRs by segregating airspace based on requirement instead of routine.</p>	

Outstanding Issues		
Serial	Issue	Action Required
1	Nil	
2		

Additional Compliance Requirements (to be satisfied by Change Sponsor)	
Serial	Requirement
1	
2	

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Recommendations	Yes/No
Is the approval of the SoS for Transport required in respect of the Environmental Impact of the airspace change?	NO
No	
Is the approval of the MoD required in respect of National Security issues surrounding the airspace change?	NO
No	

General Summary
Nil
Comments & Observations
Nil

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Operational Assessment Sign-off/ Approvals	Name	Signature	Date
Operational Assessment completed by:	██████████ AR Case Officer	██	6 April 2017
Operational Assessment approved:	██████████ Mgr AR	██	6 April 2017
Mgr AR Comments: No comment.			