

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Page 1 of 7

Airspace Change Proposal - Consultation Assessment

Version: 1.0/ 2016

Title of Airspace Change Proposal	Doncaster Sheffield Airport (DSA) PBN Procedures Addendum Consultation
Change Sponsor	DSA (Cyrrus as project management)
SARG Project Leader	[REDACTED]
Case Study commencement date	04/07/2019
Case Study report as at	17/07/2019
File Reference	ACP-2016-19

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 DAP Project Leader's efficient Project Management it may be useful that each question is also highlighted accordingly to illustrate what is resolved Green not resolved Amber or not compliant Red as part of the SARG Project Leader's efficient project management.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

1.	Consultation Process	Status
1.1	<p>Is the following information complete and satisfactory?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of the original proposal upon which consultation was conducted. • A copy of all correspondence sent by the sponsor to consultees during consultation. • A copy of all correspondence received by the sponsor from consultees during consultation. • A referenced tabular summary record of consultation actions. • Details of and reasons for any changes to the original proposal as a result of the consultation. • Details of further consultation conducted on any revised proposal. 	<p align="center">YES</p> <p align="center">YES</p> <p align="center">YES</p> <p align="center">N/A</p> <p align="center">YES</p> <p align="center">YES</p>
	<p>Executive Summary</p> <p>Following discussions with the CAA, DSA undertook a targeted addendum consultation looking at airspace classification options for the portion of requested airspace known as CTA-13 (FL85-105). The options considered in the consultation were: Classes D (as per the original proposal), E, E+RMZ, E+TMZ and E+RMZ/TMZ. As the original consultation had covered the establishment of CTA-13, Class G was not included as an option (i.e. the effective removal of CTA-13).</p> <p>The addendum consultation ran for 4 weeks from 10 May to 7 June 2019 and was limited to aviation stakeholders. Two focus groups were held during the period. Those that responded typically fell into 2 camps: Commercial aviation stakeholders felt strongly that the original classification (D) should be retained to protect CAT movements and simplify the airspace classifications within the overall airspace structure, whilst GA stakeholders strongly favoured lower classifications and continued to question the need for CTA-13 (Class G). The consultation did, however, ask stakeholders to rank the various option in order of preference and the chosen option (Class E+TMZ/RMZ) is, necessarily, a compromise to satisfy the needs of all aviation stakeholders to the greatest extent possible and further mitigation for non-transponding aircraft could be pursued through local procedures and agreements.</p> <p>The consultation satisfied CAA requirements and was well run; the sponsor was proactive in engaging with stakeholders as evidenced by the documentation submitted. All raw consultation responses have been reviewed.</p>	

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

--	--	--

1.2	Were reasonable steps taken to ensure all necessary consultees actually received the information e.g. postal/e-mail/meeting fora?	YES
	The consultation was widely promoted through local aviation stakeholders and national organisation (via NATMAC). Identified stakeholders were targeted directly via e-mail with no evidence of messages being rejected. The sponsor was proactive in contacting stakeholders and held 2 focus groups during the consultation period.	
1.3	What % of all operational consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).	19 (22.4%)
	Of the 85 stakeholders identified, 19 responded. There were a wide variety of views put forward from the various aviation sectors on the options presented. In addition, a number of stakeholders supplied comments that fell outside the scope of the consultation. These views were acknowledged by the sponsor and covered in the Consultation Feedback Report.	
1.4	What % of all environmental consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).	N/A
	The consultation was restricted to aviation stakeholders due to its nature.	
1.5	Were reasonable steps taken to ensure as much substantive feedback was obtained from the consultees e.g. through follow-up letters/phone calls?	YES
	This was a targeted consultation using focus groups to good effect and the sponsor supplied evidence to confirm that responses were actively sought.	
1.6	Have all objections to the change proposal been resolved (or sufficiently mitigated)?	YES
	<p>The sponsor produced a comprehensive feedback document that correctly identified and analysed the various responses received. The typical view of those options was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class D. This was the preferred solution for the commercial sector as it provided the highest level of protection for CAT movements and simplified the overall classification within the proposed airspace, thereby reducing the risk of confusion for flight-crew operating across different classifications. This classification was least popular with the majority of GA stakeholders due to access issues. 	

- **Class E.** Whilst a large number of GA stakeholders preferred 'Option 0' Class G (out of consultation scope), the Class E option was preferred by some of those stakeholders over the other in scope options. Class E was the least popular option for commercial operators as it failed to provide a known traffic environment required for their operations.

- **Class E+ RMZ or TMZ or both.** Whilst these options were not supported strongly by either stakeholder group, they represent a compromise position that most stakeholders could operate within. It should be noted that the application of TMZ/RMZ does not preclude non-transponding/non-radio aircraft from that airspace, as local procedures/LoAs can provide further mitigation and facilitate access.

- **Out of Scope.** A number of responses concerned issues that were out of scope of the consultation:
 - **'Option 0 – Class G'.** A number of stakeholders questioned why a Class G option was not included. That option would effectively remove CTA-13 in entirety; the justification for CTA-13 was covered in the initial consultation and is being considered as part of the CAA's decision-making process.
 - **Revised IFP Options.** IFP options were consulted upon during the original consultation and are outside of the scope of the consultation. The IFP procedures proposed will be assessed separately to this report in accordance with the CAP 725 process.
 - **Justification.** The justification for CTA-13 was questioned during the addendum consultation; however, that justification was addressed during the original consultation period and is already part of the CAA's consideration of the proposal.

In this case, there were polarised views between the various aviation sectors. The views expressed left and right of arc are incompatible and, consequently, the sponsor has moved to a compromise position to satisfy stakeholders' views to the greatest extent. No assumption is made on whether this consultation presupposes that the ACP will be approved; the addendum consultation merely adds to the weight of evidence to be considered in terms of airspace classification.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

The addendum consultation was conducted in accordance with extant guidance and CAP725 process requirements and the sponsor has amended the proposal to take into consideration widely varying views.

Outstanding Issues

Serial	Issue	Action Required
1		
2		

Additional Compliance Requirements (to be satisfied by Change Sponsor)

Serial	Requirement
1	
2	

Recommendations

Yes/No

Does the Consultation Report and associated material meet SARG requirements?

YES

The consultation activity satisfies CAA requirements.

General Summary

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Page 6 of 7

Airspace Change Proposal - Consultation Assessment

Version: 1.0/ 2016

The sponsor undertook a proactive consultation and was receptive to responses. As a result, the proposal was amended to mitigate the concerns of both commercial and GA stakeholders. Whilst the final proposal does not fully satisfy all parties, it represented a workable compromise protecting CAT movements, whilst allowing access to other airspace users. It is important that the sponsor and stakeholders continue to engage to establish access arrangements for non-transponder/non-radio aircraft.

Comments & Observations

N/A

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Consultation Assessment Sign-off/ Approvals	Name	Signature	Date
Consultation Assessment completed by:	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> Airspace Regulator	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 40px;"></div>	19/07/2019
Consultation Assessment approved by:	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> Mgr AR	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 40px;"></div>	13/11/2019
<p>MGR AR Additional Comments: The addendum consultation appears to have been effective in drawing out the differing, and at times opposed, views of the various aviation stakeholders.</p>			