

LIGHT AVIATION AIRPORTS STUDY GROUP (LAASG)

Meeting at Aviation House, Gatwick

Thursday 8 September 2005

Present:

Graham Forbes (GF), CAA (PLD)
David Beaven (DB), CAA (GAD)
Ray Elgy (RE), CAA (ASD)
Paul Fleming (PF), CAA (ASD)
John Haffenden (JHaf), AOA
Janet Hoare (JHo), BBGA/BHAB
Geoff Parker (GP), CAA (Flt Ops)
Gary Phillips (GPh), CAA (RFFS)
Dorothy Pooley (DP), GAPAN
Barry Tempest (BT), PFA
John Walker (JW), AOPA
Inez Bartolo (IB), CAA (ASD)

Apologies:

Gary Beaton (GB), CAA (ATSD)
Maria Boyle, (MB), CAA (ATSD)
David Corbett (DC), GASCo
Chris Finnigan (CF), BMAA
Mike Grierson (MG), CAA (PLD)
Martin Marsh (MM), CAA (PLD)
Terry Slater (TS), BGA
Mark Smailes (MS), CAA (DAP)

Following the publication of The Air Navigation Order 2005, Articles relevant to discussions within the LAASG have been changed. Please note the following:

**Article 34 is replaced with Article 42
Article 101 is replaced with Article 126**

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Messrs. Beaton, Smailes, Marsh, Corbett, Finnigan, Grierson, Slater and Miss Boyle.

The Group welcomed Ray Elgy (Head of Aerodrome Standards Department) to the meeting.

2 NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The notes of the previous meeting were agreed without change.

3 ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

- Action Item 29: JHo advised that it was difficult providing a summary of responses from 'small aerodromes' as they differed so much from aerodrome to aerodrome; however, an overall cost was provided. Action complete.
- Action Item 30: DP provided a resume to all members of Group. Action complete.
- Action Item 31: JW has been unable to contact Martin Robinson, and requested that the action item remain open in order that he can continue his research.
- Action Item 32: JHo has drafted the Code of Practice, with the assistance of JW. This has been distributed to the Group for consideration and will be discussed at a future meeting, when the Group have had an opportunity to consider the content.
- Action Item 33: GF advised that Legal Department recommend the CAA establish the base level of protection required; discussion in the Group suggested that ab initio and experience levels at flight schools should be included.
- Action Item 34: Prior to the meeting, MS distributed an e-mail response from the Maps & Charts Department, explaining that any additional 'symbol on a map' would need to be of clear benefit to chart users backed up by a strong CAA policy. In MS's absence, IB reassurance the Group that it was not DAP 'refusing' to grant an ATZ to an unlicensed aerodrome, but the application of Rule 39 of the Air Navigation Order. It was decided to defer further comment until a future meeting when MS is in attendance.
- Action Item 35: Table of aircraft sizes presented under Agenda Item 5.

4 FLIGHT TRAINING – ISSUES UPDATE

- **Categorised Levels of Protection and Code of Practice**

GF considers that, having sought advice from several different areas of Industry, the base levels of protection will emerge whilst reviewing of the Code of Practice. GF also believes that a wide consultation will be necessary in order to seek comment on whether the concept of flying training from unlicensed aerodromes is possible. He considers that EASA will support a fairly wide common denominator across Europe, and whatever they decide will impact on the UK. PLD are proposing to send a small team, most likely led by MG (PLD) to selected flying training schools in Europe (France, Germany and Holland) to see the facilities they have. In response to this, BT advised that he is due to travel to Portugal (Evora?) and would be happy to enquire as to the facilities required over there. Although GF welcomed this offer, he felt it might be a little bit too early to provide a brief set of questions.

With regard to the CofP, JHo believes it may be necessary to change some legal requirements of the Air Navigation Order (ANO); in particular Rule 5 which states 'take off and landing from Govt or licensed aerodromes only'; if aerodromes conducting flying training become unlicensed, the current Rule 5 would preclude them from the ability to operate. DB concurred with JHo's sentiments, recognising this as an issue that needs to be examined along with, for example, ATZs. However, DB highlighted that recent changes in the ANO, in particular flight over

congested areas, which changed from 1500ft to 1000ft, meant that the perceived problem of over flying congested areas is not considered to be as great as it would have been had the 1500ft rule remained. Discussion followed regarding the term 'normal aviation practice', and whether practice approaches should be considered under this heading; there was general consensus that it should and, as far as the Group were aware, this had not been legally challenged.

5 RFFS LEVELS

○ **Types of aircraft 2730-5700kg**

IB presented 3 tables to the Group, in order to focus on the maximum seating capacity applicable to aircraft up to 5700kg. Whilst it was recognised that the list was not exhaustive, it was presented as an example to show the potential seating capacity of aircraft of this size.

○ **Industry Costs**

JHo's summarised the responses to her survey, which resulted in approximately 20 replies, all supporting the request to dispose of perceived excessive RFF (Rescue and Fire Fighting) requirements. The annual costs (ranging from £4,000 to £28,000 depending on aerodrome) include training, foam, first aid courses, maintenance and PPE (Personal Protective Equipment). General discussion followed regarding the appropriateness of RFF cover at light aviation airports.

○ **Industry Proposals**

In putting forward Industry proposals, JHo explained that the minimum scale of facilities could be found in Appendix D of the CoP. JHo believes that RFFS requirements at light aviation aerodromes (below 5700kg) are excessive and proposes requirements more in line with the CofP, dependent upon size of aircraft. In addition, she believes CAP 699 should not apply to aircraft below 5700kg, preferring to see an alternative CAP for light aviation aerodromes. JH requested that RFF requirements for helicopters should be reviewed, in particular the response times.

ASD response: RE thanked the external group members for their work on the proposal, and also thanked GPh for his contribution. He proposed that a sub-group be formed, possibly made up of RE, GPh and some industry members to review, compare and contrast the work and return to the table with an agreed set of data. However, before this work can take place the sub-group would need time to review the proposals put forward in the CofP. It was agreed that JHo would be the contact point for communication.

**Action 36: Sub-group to be formed to discuss RFF
JHo nominated as contact point**

PF offered the Group a cautionary note about associating a CofP with a licence, especially when proposing changes to licensing requirements for RFFS. He reminded the Group that it is an ICAO obligation to provide RFFS at an aerodrome that is licensed/certificated in accordance with Annex 14 – as in the case of those licensed by ASD.

6 PUBLIC TRANSPORT – INDUSTRY PROPOSALS

Industry proposes that any aeroplane less than 5700kg, including scheduled movements, should be able to operate from any site, whether licensed or not. In addition, the apparent

anomaly in Article 126, where A-A public transport flights require a licensed aerodrome and A-B public transport do not, needs to be examined.

Flight Ops response: GP advised the Group that weight categorisation is not the important issue. By concentrating on Article 126, GP feels that the real issue regarding public transport has been missed. His Department (Flight Operations) is interested in appropriate levels of safety being applied to flights for the purpose of public transport. The important issue when discussing a licensed aerodrome is the safety measures that have been put in place, thereby allowing the regulatory authority to issue the 'certificate or licence'. Article 42 of the ANO talks about the responsibilities of an aircraft operator.¹ In particular, that 'every place' will be adequately manned and equipped, to ensure so far as practicable, the safety of the aircraft and its passengers. JHo queried the provision of 'manned and equipped', stating it would not be possible to 'man and equip' a small strip. GP responded by saying that if it is not manned and equipped, then how is an operator able to ensure the safety of the aircraft and its passengers?. In addition, a similar requirement will shortly form part of Annex III of EC regulation 3922, which will enshrine it as a European Regulation. Following GP's comment, JW questioned why Article 42 does not refer you to the requirements of Article 126. GP confirmed he did not have ownership of Article 126 and could not comment on this.

PF thanked GP for his comment on public transport, which offered clarity to this important issue. He also asked the Group to concentrate its focus on Article 126 as this is specifically mentioned in the Terms of Reference for the Group. Key areas should be examined, including 'international flight' and 'public use' aerodromes, which should, according to ICAO, be certificated. The UK, as a State, has to decide which airports need to be certificated under Annex 14. PF offered the following for debate:

International Flight

What is an 'international flight'? The Group could explore this.

Public use

Is flying training 'public use'? ICAO does not define 'public use', thereby allowing the UK to interpret it. For example, we could perhaps deem public use not to include flying training. These are questions that the Group should explore and examine, reviewing Article 126 in that context. DB suggested that public use should be placed as a separate agenda item at one of the LAASG meetings, adding that this issue is an important one to capture. DB also proposed that one of the recommendations of the report could be for the CAA to propose a definition of 'international/public use' and take this forward to the Department for Transport (DfT).

GP commented that an aerodrome will have to decide how it wants to set up its business, knowing that it will be a large jump to provide the necessary support to allow public transport, recognising that there might be a divide amongst aerodromes that carry out flying training and those that carry out public transport. JHo said that it has been her concern for a long time that the 'middle-level' of aviation in the UK may be wiped out because the big airports do not want to accept general aviation, and the light aviation airports will not be able to reach RFF Cat 3 due to the costs involved.

¹ The operator of an aircraft registered in the United Kingdom shall not permit the aircraft to fly for the purpose of public transport without first... satisfying himself by every reasonable means that every place (whether or not an aerodrome) at which it is intended to take off or land and any alternate place (whether or not an aerodrome) at which a landing may be made are suitable for the purpose and in particular that they will be adequately manned and equipped at the time at which it is reasonably estimated such a take-off or landing will be made (including such manning and equipment as may be prescribed) to ensure so far as practicable the safety of the aircraft and its passengers

General discussion on the weight categorisation and seating capacity followed, along with discussion on off-shore helicopter movements.

DB believes it is important that the Group establish whether they are going to make a decision on a specific item, ie international flight and public use, as to whether it is solvable in the lifetime of this Group or whether the report is going to make a recommendation that the CAA/DfT should review it.

It was decided at the end of this agenda item, that the CAA would initiate a series of internal discussions to debate/define the issue of international flight and public use. In parallel, the industry members would establish which aerodromes are categorised as 'customs airfields'. PF advised that ICAO hold a list, promulgated in the Air Navigation Plan, of significant UK airports (approximately 40). It may be beneficial to establish the criteria used to decide what makes them 'significant'. DB raised concern that the Group still appear to be mixing international public use and public transport and felt it important that the Group understand they are different issues and must remain so: International public use falls under an obligation for the provision of facilities in the UK in relation to the Chicago Convention; public transport issues relate to appropriate standards for the conduct of public transport flight.

Action 37: Industry members (led by JHo) to draw up list of 'customs airports'

7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

DP advised that at a previous meeting of the GASRWG she had been invited to prepare a list of guidelines for self-auditing for instructors at registered facilities, possibly based on the aeroplane training manual. It was proposed that DP forward an e-mail to IB expanding on this issue, so that it can be noted on file for possible reference at a later date.

Action 38: DP to send GASRWG self-auditing guidelines to IB

DP also advised that the most recent meeting of the GASRWG produced some statistics showing the analyses of accidents/incidents are: hard landings (25%); runway excursions (22%); gear collapses on ground (20%); loss of control on ground (17%) etc. It was agreed that DB would provide a copy of the statistics to IB.

Action 39: SIDD to provide statistics to IB

CAP 699

JHo stated that CAP 699 has no validity internationally and is purely a CAA concept of how training should be conducted.

GPh opened the debate by advising the Group that he is involved in reviewing the appropriateness of CAP 699 and its relationship to Government national operational standards for training RFF personnel. The document accords to ICAO, and was presented to members of Industry, including AOA, MoD and AFOA (Airport Fire Officers Association) amongst others. The terminology used followed a set of Government standards, although it is recognised the terminology, in some instances, may complicate the document. GPh clarified the concerns regarding frequency of training, explaining that larger aerodromes could afford to place resources to interpret the document. However, as it had become apparent that smaller aerodromes were having difficulty interpreting the intent of the document, ASD inspectors produced an 'example' training manual, giving guidance to those smaller aerodromes. It clearly states in the document that the licensee dictates the level of training at RFF Special, 1 and 2.

In addition, GPh advised the Group that the RFFS Working Group (involving Approved Training Providers and AOA) have produced an abridged training module which allows

'experienced' staff with demonstrable records, to complete a less time consuming version than the 6 week model currently in existence, as long as the fire fighters have been involved in appropriate training at the appropriate level, thereby allowing a 6 week course to be completed in 1 week.

Framework of Final report

The Group agreed that the report, in its final format, should be presented by December. It was therefore decided that because the Group will most likely only meet for another two sessions, a draft framework of the report should be established by the October meeting. The structure of the report could be 'sectioned' by the agenda items as discussed. The 'introduction' may highlight the apparent anomalies in Article 126, which could lead into other subjects. DB suggested an historical lead-in, possibly using the wording from BT's Paper. JHo believes that presentation is very important. For example, Article 42's JAR equivalent (JAR OPS 1.220) should be included in the report, in addition to the legal instruments.

The report will be presented to the Head of Aerodromes, Air Traffic and Licensing Standards Division.

Action 40: CAA to draft framework to final Report

8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday 4 October 2005

ACTIONS ARISING (Action items 1-35 allocated to previous meetings)

- Action Item 31: (carried over from previous meeting)
JW to approach Martin Robinson regarding European regulations
- Action Item 36: Sub-group to be formed to discuss RFF issues (RE, GP, JHo, JW) and report findings to Group**
- Action Item 37: Industry members, led by JHo, to draw up list of 'customs airports'**
- Action Item 38: DP to send GASRWG self-auditing guidelines to IB for noting on file.**
- Action Item 39: SIDD (Safety Investigation Data) to provide GASRWG statistics to IB for inclusion in statistics record**
- Action Item 40: CAA to draft framework to final Report**