




AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSAL CONSULTATION ASSESSMENT

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Title of Airspace Change Proposal | Moray Firth Transponder Mandatory Zone (TMZ) |
| Change Sponsor | BOWL/SSER & MORL/EDPR |
| SARG Project Leader | [REDACTED] |
| Case Study commencement date | 06/08/2015 |
| Case Study report as at | 09/11/2015 |

| |
|---|
| Instructions |
| <p>In providing a response for each question, please ensure that the 'Status' column is completed using the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes• No• Partially• N/A <p>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 (), not resolved () or not compliant () as part of the DAP Project Leader's efficient project management.</p> |

| 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>The proposal was for a simple off-shore TMZ. The consultation, which ran from 31 March to 24 June 2015 focussed mainly on aviation stakeholders, but local government representatives were included in the consultation. A referenced tabular summary record of consultation actions was not provided by the sponsor, but this was not to the detriment of the case study given the limited scope of the consultation and the overall number of responses. Of the 111 stakeholders identified by the sponsor and agreed at Framework Briefing, 14 responded (13%)</p> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No*</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> |
| 1.2 | <p>Were reasonable steps taken to ensure all necessary consultees actually received the information e.g. postal/e-mail/meeting fora?</p> <p>Consultation material was distributed to stakeholders via e-mail. This was reasonable given the lack of on-shore impact of the proposal</p> | <p>Yes</p> |
| 1.3 | <p>What % of all operational consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p> <p>Of the 55 aviation stakeholders identified, 12 responded. Of those, 1 stakeholder objected (HIAL Wick); the rest either supported the proposal or registered 'no objection'. Whilst this is a low response rate, the proposal itself is not especially contentious and only had a direct impact on certain stakeholders. Therefore, a low response rate could be expected.</p> | <p>11% (12)</p> |
| 1.4 | <p>What % of all environmental consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p> <p>Of the 57 no-aviation stakeholders, only 2 stakeholders responded and were in support of the proposal. Both stakeholders represented the Renewables industry. Again, this low response rate could be expected.</p> | <p>1.8% (2)</p> |
| 1.5 | <p>Were reasonable steps taken to ensure as much substantive feedback was obtained from the consultees e.g. through follow-up letters/phone calls?</p> | <p>Yes</p> |

| | | |
|------------|--|------------------|
| | An e-mail reminder was sent to consultees on 15 June 2015. | |
| 1.6 | Have all objections to the change proposal been resolved (or sufficiently mitigated)? | Partially |
| | <p>The original objection to the wind turbine development was from MoD and concerned the effect of the development on operations at RAF Lossiemouth. In response to that objection, and as part of the planning consent associated with the development, the sponsor initiated the TMZ proposal. In parallel with the ACP activity, the sponsor has facilitated the creation of a safety case for the proposal that has been accepted by MoD.</p> <p>The only aviation objection to the proposal, on consultation, was lodged by HIAL (Wick) and concerned the impact of the proposal on procedures and activity at Wick. HIAL provided detailed analyses showing the perceived interaction of the TMZ with the airport's Instrument Flight Procedures. In response the sponsor has undertaken to facilitate Letters of Agreement (LoA) between Wick and RAF Lossiemouth to ensure that the former's operations are not unduly impacted. These LoA have yet to be agreed and, therefore, resolution of the HIAL objection is yet to be achieved.</p> <p>A key GA stakeholder, whilst not objecting to the proposal, raised the concern that TMZs could become the de facto solution to wind turbine interference, but noted the sponsor's commitment to funding a technical solution that would permit the withdrawal of the TMZ in due course.</p> <p>A further stakeholder noted the requirements for robust procedures to mitigate the impact of non-transponding aircraft in the vicinity of the TMZ, and possible transponder failure. The sponsor noted that such mitigation would be included in the RAF Lossiemouth safety assessment together with a training needs analysis to ensure that controllers were adequately prepared for the implementation of the TMZ.</p> <p>The developers also undertook to provide support to the local civil ANSPs in their safety management activities.</p> | |

| Outstanding Issues | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Serial | Issue | Action Required |
| 1.6 | Mitigation of HIAL objection | Production of agreed procedures/LoAs between the respective units |
| | | |
| | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Additional Compliance Requirements (to be satisfied by Change Sponsor) | |
|--|-------------|
| Serial | Requirement |
| | N/A |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| Recommendations | Yes/No |
|--|--------|
| Does the Consultation Report and associated material meet SARG requirements? | Yes |
| The consultation Report and associated material meet SARG requirements | |

| General Summary |
|--|
| This was a straightforward proposal and consultation. The consultation was undertaken in accordance with the published guidance and the sponsor correctly identified the issues raised. Mitigation of those issues has yet to be confirmed/concluded and, therefore, any SARG Decision should be conditional on that activity being completed to the satisfaction of the stakeholders confirmed. |
| Comments |
| It is disappointing that, seemingly, the TMZ/Wick interaction was not identified during Stages 2/3 of the process. |
| Observations |

N/A

| Consultation Assessment Sign-off/Approvals | | | |
|---|-------------|------------------|-------------|
| | Name | Signature | Date |
| Consultation Assessment completed by James Walker (APCC Representative) | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | 09/11/2015 |
| Consultation Assessment approved by Stuart Lindsey (Head of AR) | [REDACTED] | | |

| GD SARG Comment/Approval | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| | | |
| Name | Signature | Date |