

LEEDS EAST AIRPORT AND SHERBURN IN ELMET MEETING

WESTFERRY HOUSE/ONLINE

31ST MARCH 2022

Westferry Attendees:

- ██████████) – Sherburn in Elmet Airfield (SAC) Consultant
- ████████████████████) – Merlin Aerospace Consulting Ltd, Leeds East Airport (LEA) Consultant
- ██████████) – LEA/SAC Sponsor
- ██████████) – Airfield Representative Rufforth Airfield East/Strut Co-ordinator Vale of York (VoY) Strut Light Aircraft Association (LAA)
- ██████████) – GNSS Facilitation Team (FT) Manager (*Chairman*)
- ██████████) – GNSS FT Air Traffic Management (*Secretary*)
- ██████████) – GNSS FT Stakeholders
- ████████████████████) – GNSS FT Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP)
- ██████████) – Airspace Co-ordinator, Regional Soaring Airspace Group (RSAG)
- ████████████████████) – Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA)

Virtual Attendees:

- ██████████) – Airspace Representative, Burn Gliding Club (BGC)
- ████████████████████) – Club Representative, York Gliding Centre (YGC), Rufforth West
- ██████████) – Club Representative, Wolds Gliding Club (WGC)
- ████████████████████) – Airspace Co-ordinator, RSAG, Retiring Safety Officer BGC
- ██████████) – British Gliding Association (BGA) Airspace Group member, All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) - General Aviation (GA) Representative
- ██████████) – CEO, BGA

Apologies:

- ██████████) – Chairman, Real Aircraft Company, Brighton Aerodrome

Pre-Meeting Administration

██████ requested:

- Agreement to the minutes' timeline – draft by W/E 08/04. Comments back by w/e/ 22/04 final minutes published by no later than 28/04. Minutes posted on CAA website. All agreed.
- Copy of any presentations to be sent to ██████ for Airspace Regulation (AR) Consultation/Engagement team to see. Agreement for copies to be published on CAA websites for LEA and SAC ACPs, redacted if required. All agreed.

Correction to meeting invitation - ██████████ representing York Gliding Centre at Rufforth West, not Yorkshire Gliding Club which is at Sutton Bank.

CAA AR have agreed an extension to provision of feedback on LEA SAC ACPs until 28/04/2022.

Introduction

■ welcomed everyone and thanked them for their support. Meeting of aviation stakeholders from the VoY area to discuss flight safety concerns and to provide clarification where appropriate. Looking to achieve a productive and constructive meeting to identify any opportunities to make improvements and address concerns.

Personal introductions:

- – Career as Government civil servant, Chairman of Yorkshire Gliding Club, Sutton Bank. Airspace Co-ordinator RSAG
- – SAC member, LEA/SAC project manager, Private Pilot Licence/Instrument Rating (PPL/IR)
- – Merlin Aerospace Consulting, LEA consultant, previously in Aerodrome Operations, CAA Aerodrome Policy Officer, involved in development of CAA CAP 1122, recently Acting Accountable Manager, Sywell Aerodrome
- – CEO AOPA, experienced PPL/IR
- – PPL, aircraft based at Rufforth East, VoY Strut LAA, previously Eastern Airways Operations
- – GA pilot, former CAA GA Policy Officer, currently civil commercial pilot, columnist for Flyer magazine and CAA consultant contributor to Skyway Code and Safety Sense Leaflets. SAC consultant
- – Former Royal Air Force (RAF) navigator, CAA IFP designer, Chief Designer IFP Airservices Australia, GNSS FT IFP specialist
- – Former RAF Air Traffic Control Officer, management roles in NATS (civil air traffic service provider) and secondment to CAA AR, GNSS FT Airspace and stakeholder specialist
- – BGC member, career as mechanical engineer including engineering safety investigation experience, highly qualified glider pilot for more than 50 years including instructor qualification
- – BGA Airspace Group member, APPG GA lead, experienced glider pilot, former RAF pilot and then civil commercial pilot
- – BGC Safety officer in process of transferring to Pocklington, Airspace Co-ordinator RSAG, former police officer and then Emergency Planning Officer for a number of local authorities
- - WGC, experienced glider pilot and civil commercial pilot for KLM
- – instructor/nominated Airspace Member at YGC, former RAF Engineer and then civil commercial pilot flying on aircraft from Cessna to B747
- – former AAC, RAF helicopter and fixed wing pilot now civil commercial pilot flying in business aviation, Aviation Management Consultant, GNSS FT Lead

Purpose of Meeting

■ explained purpose was to talk about the ACPs for LEA/SAC. CAA has noticed issues that have arisen through the process which could impact upon flight safety and stakeholder relationships within VoY. CAA AR requested the FT to facilitate a meeting to support all stakeholders to discuss and identify issues, assist in providing clarification and seek solutions where possible and to build good relationships/communication. Impressive amount of aviation experience and variety around table and we should try and use experience around table to seek solutions.

Meeting not about wider CAA or airspace policy issues. Meeting will be kept on focus.

Attendees requested to be respectful of all views - try not to be entrenched. Acknowledged that Class G airspace is for all users, want to encourage collaborations, airspace-sharing and the promotion of flight safety.

Secretary of State (SoS) for the Department for Transport (DfT) is a keen GA pilot, wants to improve safety for GA recovering to smaller airfields. Funding given to support development of RNP approaches and GNSS FT created to provide guidance and support to applicants. State sponsored and monitored programme.

█ – requested that broader issues raised are taken forward from meeting to CAA by █ and not ignored. Concern that potential proliferation of IAPs will have adverse effect on access to airspace for GA through pilots simply avoiding “feathers” on charts and proliferation of local procedures. █ agreed to take forward any specific generic concerns that are identified and which the CAA can influence.

ACTION █

Briefings

Post-meeting note: there were several IT connectivity issues throughout the meeting which were resolved at Westferry by the IT specialist, but which were not fully resolved for virtual attendees. These caused some disruption to timing and presentations and adversely affected effective communications particularly for those participating remotely. All presentations were eventually shown, although in some cases were abbreviated due to time and size of data package. The full presentations are available as a record and contain in detail all the information given at the meeting and can be referred to when reading the minutes, which only contain abbreviated notes.

█ gave a brief background. Commenced ACP in 2014/2015, policy challenges caused delays hence the 7 years in progress. Presentation used to show Runway 28 track over ground for IAP and MAP. Runway 10 shorter FAT to take account of LBA. CAP 1122 used to assess operation. Mid-Air Collision (MAC) identified as primary issue. IFR/IFR and VFR/IFR risks considered in context of local traffic at SAC and local airspace environment. Precis given of mitigations described in safety case (fully listed in presentation). Low utilisation of 2 per day expected 10 max (1 per hour) between the two airfields. 2 per day is upper estimate for IFR use when cloud base is 1200ft or less. Low level of activity expected. Integrations with VFR training complex so circuit restrictions put in place. VFR use by instructors in accordance with SERA 3220¹ with safety pilot and local instructions. Pilot Brief, local publicity. Post-implementation review: safety review will include all stakeholders.

█ rather than run through ACP submission briefing will look at issues raised by stakeholders. Osprey (Approved Procedure Design Organisation) designed IAPs split into Cat A & B/C & D to reduce footprint. Routes designed to minimise effect on stakeholders but to comply with PANs OPS.

Tracking of Missed Approach (MAP) for all four CATs used C & D criteria which made them larger than necessary. Re-designed to reduce A & B size. No CAT D operations expected, but sponsor wishes to continue with facility for future potential use.

1 x CAT C aircraft based at LEA. Statistically less than 0.25% MAP in anger due to weather or other issues. If training taking place not possible to achieve more than 2 moments per slot, so no more than 2 training MAPs would occur.

Air Ground Operator (AGO) will broadcast on Glider Ops frequency when RNP activity is taking place. Letters of Agreement (LoAs) with YGC and BGC to provide information on IAPs and share information developed but not agreed. AGO can make calls to launch site to provide RNP activity information.

█ commented that there are a range of gliding frequencies that may be being used by local and transiting gliding traffic in the area. The proposals as they stand introduce further RT complexity in an already complex RT environment. Will gain an understanding of each other's Radio Telephony (RT) issues with RSAG brief.

¹ Commissioning Implementing Regulation (EU) No 923/2012 of 26th September 2012. Annex Part 3, General rules and collision avoidance, Annex subpart 2, Avoidance of collisions, Annex subsubpart SERA3220 Simulated instrument flights.

[Law 923_2012 \(20 May 2021\).pdf \(caa.co.uk\)](#)

[AMC & GM Package for Standardised European Rules of the Air \(SERA\) \(caa.co.uk\)](#)

Communications and sharing of activity would help improve flight safety. Mutual sharing of activity is good, stakeholders have tried to work together – want to agree LoAs and find ways to agree. Lots of work and collaboration already, sometime fractious but all want to work together.

Rwy 06 CAT C & D not intended to be used unless co-ordinated and agreed with BGC. Rwy 24 CAT A & B co-ordination procedures originally agreed with YGC but suspended when CAT C & D issues arose. Hold over Full Sutton and Pocklington removed to address issue with airspace conflict and new MAP tracks introduced. Tadcaster affects CAT C & D routes and causes them to come very close to YGC. CAT C & D not intended to be used without co-ordination with YGC. Intention to only permit CAT C & D movements in early or late slots outside of gliding activity hours. Mitigations outlined (fully listed in presentation). UK FIS available by LoA with Leeds Bradford Airport (LBA) and Doncaster Sheffield Airport (DSA) and a dedicated conspicuity code has been allocated.

█ raised concern about number of calls for transit aircraft to make if observing good airmanship and best practice.

█ - LBA /DSA will provide UK FIS and will also be able to observe conspicuity code of IAP traffic. Senior Air Traffic Control Officer (SATCO) LBA has advised that controllers would be able to pass general traffic information on activity observed.

█ raised the point that Electronic Conspicuity (EC) systems are a future way forward and should be promoted

For CAT C & D operations, LEA have offered:

- a) BGC - no CAT C & D RNP on Rwy 06 without co-ordination and endeavour to arrange on BGC non-flying days
- b) BGC and YGC - no CAT C & D training
- c) YGC - CAT C & D would only be arranged following co-ordination, early AM and late PM being some options

Traffic study has shown relatively little traffic in the vicinity of either aerodromes on many good days. Good co-ordination important between all stakeholders.

█ requested clarification if VFR flights are also subject to slots – confirmed at both airfields. Also commented that EC highlights need for flexible cascade of capability, clear policy and directions known and agreed for use of EC and suitable systems to be provided.

FlightAware in place at LEA and SAC but can't officially be used. Discussion about Flight Information Display Systems (FIDS) use at AGCS. Need for development of procedures for AGCS to use monitoring systems proactively. **ACTION** █.

RSAG – █ RSAG represents several clubs operating in VoY and transiting the area – engagement level for ACPs has varied across time. Outstanding issues:

- Unresolved conflict - introduction of IAPs and/or MAPs into overhead of Burn below maximum winch launch height (3100') and across a regular tow-out area of YGC.
- Use of IAPs and MAPs in all weather conditions rather than restricting use to poor weather/low visibility introduces the known human factors risk of pilots using instruments moving from areas of IMC to areas of VMC with large numbers of VFR traffic.

Procedures don't mitigate concerns adequately. Lack of awareness of aerial activity taking place for example transit traffic leaving the Upton Corridor into VoY adjacent to LEA/SAC navigation routes use northern edge of Humber and Pontefract as turning points on navigations so flying right through area.

█ - Queried if current VFR operations in the area run OK.

█ - VFR operations run Ok. Introduction of IAPs is a risk – changes operating environment.

█ – Responded that the introduction of the IAPs didn't change the environment "all pilots in VMC fly VFR".

LoAs - lots of discussions and moving in the right directions with BGC and YGC but stuck with Cat C & D issue – needs to be resolved. LoAs that exclude access to larger areas of airspace to accommodate IAPs not OK.

Full Sutton elected not to engage with sponsor. (NB: comment not attributed to █ – stakeholder attribution not recorded)

Mitigations for LEA/SAC challenged: MAP tracks not currently flown because IAP doesn't exist, and so new risk is added by implementation. Discussed possibility of CAT C & D – no co-ordination = no fly. However, both A & B and CAT C & D concern of conflict with Rufforth West.

Co-ordination – more detail needed about communications and co-ordination calls with local airfields – how will it work, what actions will the AGCS operator take – LoA could agree it.

Transit aircraft – lots of additional RT calls for pilots, involving calling LBA/DSA and LEA/SAC - significant workload increase.

█ – Disagreed that there would be increased workload

█ – looking at how the two airfields and their local airspaces work together with IAPs in place. Safety cases lacking a description of practically how the airspace will work jointly, and aircraft will be expected to transit through the area. Collective set of procedures for how the IAPs will work between both airfields missing and should be developed. **ACTION** █

█ – look at Gloucester area, also Oxford and Kemble. Calls are made to notify service providers of gliding general presence and larger activities such as competitions taking place through area to improve traffic awareness. Simplification of comms procedures for everyone important. Recommend █ contact SATCO Gloucester to find out about how they interact with local gliding community and share information. █ will provide contact details. **ACTION** █

█ described Mayfly programmes published by Shoreham and Redhill daily on their website which can also provide additional information for access by local and transit pilots prior to flight.

█ – analysis of interaction between proposed IAP tracks and sailplane activity in local areas identifies risk points greater at LEA/SAC than at, for example, Sywell (568 compared to 87 respectively). More complex safety issues to address than at other airfields.

█ – generic briefing of activity in local area is useful and then a simple RT call by a pilot of presence is all that should be necessary – no other actions should be required.

█ – MAP expectation of use - MAPs cut through YGC soaring area. No understanding within any given hour slot where the aircraft might be makes avoidance/reduction of potential conflict difficult. Not an exercise in simply advising traffic when aircraft are using the procedure as wide variety of experience flying from Rufforth and YGC concern is especially towards lower end (e.g., typically the 14-year-old or early solo student pilots). What are we expected to do with the information; are we expected to cede access (given the significant threat posed) in Class G airspace?

█ – MAP self-limiting. Utilisation of MAP regarded as low making very little difference to risk.

█ – If it's low we still need to have a plan for potential conflict management. A visiting pilot unfamiliar with LEA or the area may be likely to use the IAP, given that it should be reliable to present a safe option. Not good enough to provide a procedure which will increase hazard, on the basis it is unlikely that it will be used. A Safety Case should consider and make allowances for those instances when the 'Swiss cheese elements of an incident do indeed align at some point in the future'.

█ – Management of risk; likelihood of incident is low so that is a mitigation.

█ – use of MAP in anger is low and weather to cause it likely to preclude gliding. VFR MAP may be followed but more likely that aircraft would join circuit.

█ - Could LoAs/local operating procedures preclude use of MAPs during VFR training – e.g. aircraft are required to join visual circuit at airfield or route VFR direct back to IAF if flying a further approach.

█ – Agreed it was a possibility as generally local requirements already in place that aircraft have to amend their circuits and activities to take account of noise sensitive areas or other restrictions.

█ – Imposed minima for these IAPs require consideration of cloud/vis prior to flight. Acceptable weather minima likely to be higher than actual Obstacle Clearance Height (OCH) (procedure minima) so weather better than OCH means MAP likely to be even lower risk.

█ – Unplanned MAP occurrence low and not likely an issue. VFR MAP agree in LoA how MAPs will route VFR to avoid areas of concern seems viable solution.

█ - Aircraft will be speaking to LBA/DSA during MAP - surveillance service.

█ – If a transit brief can be agreed use of LAA seminars and BGA briefings to communicate information.

█ – GA more disparate than glider community needs a CAA GA publication and other general publications to communicate across the broader GA world. **ACTION** █

█ – Pilot Brief – location of other stakeholders/AIGA/sites/activities needs to be better; currently too generalised.

█ **Rufforth East/VoY Strut LAA** Local activity includes powered flight from D40 Diamond Star to flexi-wings, three-axis microlights, gyrocopters and LAA permit aircraft. Pilots have become used to the airspace as it is today, differing from the RAF days. Communication in the area a mixed bag, some talk to Doncaster, others Leeming -communications complexity in future would be major issue.

Feathers on charts help pilots identify airfields with procedures and many fly around and avoid even though it is Class G (effectively removes sharing of the Class G airspace). There is also assumption pilots will talk to the airfield with feathers when transiting the area; CAA guidance material recommends a “call within 10nm of feathers”. Has there been adequate consideration for how this will work? How any transit traffic will be taken into account is not clear with regard to calls.

Discussed CAA guidance on transiting through Class G airspace with RNP procedures. Nothing specific to local area currently available; there is the Pilot Brief but is more for arriving aircraft rather than transiting ac.

█ - it had added to the complexity of the airspace and how well things worked would depend upon how a pilot responded to any guidance.

Net result was statement that need simple SOPs for pilots when transiting ‘feathers’.

█ – how will calls be handled – what information will be communicated?

█ – education campaign for pilots is important.

█ – again highlights need for guidance documents for transit through this airspace and share with organisations. Also, possibility that a local document could be used to develop more general guidance for publication and a template for any future ACP applications. **ACTION** █

█ – sees desire for IAPs but sees complexity of airspace as issue for transit pilots. Workload will increase and so pilots may avoid area and feel excluded from that airspace.

█ – must be one collective document for guidance.

█ – LoAs were in part trying to address this and make reasonable adjustments to accommodate concerns.

■ - Query why the 24 IAF at 9nms is so low – higher would be better for local airspace utilisation. APDO may be able to comment. **ACTION** ■

■ – Continuous Descent Approach (CDA) is promoted as standard operating procedure where possible. 3^o glidepath is standard.

■ minima is based upon obstacle clearance which may affect design.

■ – local perception that LEA will make every effort to develop business to fill all available slots so there will potentially be increasing RNP activity.

■ – request to ■ and ■ to work with ■ to develop a guidance procedure as discussed above. Agreed. Action already recorded.

■ – remember other organisations such as GASCO can also help with publication of information.

■ **Brief** Two major problems for BGC, complexity of IAPs within the airspace and use of procedures in VMC. Support for use of procedures in IMC, no support for use in VMC. BGC movement at busiest likely to be busier than SAC. Irregular tracks flown by gliders in local area due to nature of glider operations.

Risk of collision is a concern. Powered aircraft fly faster than gliders. Not possible for a glider pilot to see a faster powered aircraft approaching (overtaking) from behind. No surveillance cover in the local area since Linton closed. Discussion with an IMC training instructor pilot suggests that such instruction is a busy task and that there can be difficulty in also maintaining a good look-out.

SAC IAP issue with flight at 1900 ft in local soaring area. 1900ft is the minimum height to glide to a safe landing and therefore keeps gliders within the IAP track area. IAP feathers would be going through a busy piece of airspace. No support for SAC Rwy 28 IAP without surveillance or further mitigations. Lack of IAPs at other airfields without surveillance and which pass through other airfield areas of activity such as Air Traffic Zones (ATZ) not known of and so safety data not available to contribute to risk quantification.

LEA MAPs are a risk to BGC. CAT C & D MAP Rwy 06 not supported because it goes Burn overhead.

■ – Want to understand how you avoid each other when operating in the local airspace, how risk is assessed – how do you do that safely?

■ - We have good look-out techniques and visibility from gliders; operating in VMC head-up - an IFR pilot will be flying head-down.

■ – all pilots are required to look-out when flying in VMC.

Discussion about look-out, visibility and requirement for IFR pilot to maintain see and avoid when in VMC.

Concern that as soon as approaches are published, and feathers are on chart it will encourage pilots to fly the approach without approval.

■ – Clarified that chart will be published with restriction only to be flown with ATZ and AGCS in place. Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) requires Prior Permission Required (PPR) and associated operating restrictions to be complied with to fly approach. Any pilot not complying is in breach of air navigation legislation and would be liable to investigation and potential prosecution. Safety/incident reporting and post-implementation review work would provide opportunity for any such suspected incident to be considered.

■ – Rules of the Air (RotA) state fixed-wing must give way to sailplanes. Business need for the approach but will only be available using the slot system. Restrictions to accommodate operations and not have too many approaches.

■ – Frustrated with comments as SAC have said that they will not carry out VFR training when BGC are flying

Concern about use of the term self-authorising in terms of the IAPs at the possibility that it may mean a pilot choosing to fly an IAP without PPR and the associated restrictions/arrangements put in place.

■ - Clarified that the IAPs would only be available to be used in accordance with the published procedures and PPR requirements – no self-authorising would be permitted. CAA will audit and monitor compliance and such activity would be outside of the safety case and operation proposed for approval.

■ - Asked about the legal standing of an LoA – is it a regulatory document?

■ - Responded not a regulated document as such, has no legal standing in of itself, but is an active part of the supporting documentation for the safety case and ACP. Once agreed and signed it becomes beholden upon all parties to work to and uphold the LoA.

Concern regarding how risk can be quantified when no such similar approach exists currently. Discussion about the consideration of risk across many ACPs in complex airspace environments and mixed operations, use of CAA expertise and data from sources such as the Airprox Board and AAIB informs quantification judgements.

■ – glider pilots have better look-out skills than other pilots. 7 airprox incidents involving GA and gliders reported to have occurred in Burn/Selby area (2016-2022). 145 overflights of Burn glider site as marked on the VFR chart in the last year. Airspace Infringement Working Group (AIWG) request to BGC to submit Mandatory Occurrence Reports (MORs) on all overflights. 3 MORs already filed in the last two weeks. Example that on 22nd March ad-hoc flying day in the afternoon an SAC aircraft departed the airfield and flew over Burn.

■ - asked for further information as SAC not aware of incident or that MOR had been filed. ■ referred to MOR now being with CAA; information available from that source if required.

Post-meeting note: ■ subsequently discussed incident – aircraft was a visitor not Sherburn based-aircraft. Agreement to share such incident information in future to support local investigation and flight safety improvement.

Unconvinced that dangers will be managed adequately by LEA/SAC mitigations. Not sure that sponsor understands difficulty of glider operations and integrations of VFR training into mix.

■ - pointed out that RSAG/BGC withdrew from LoA discussions.

■ - nothing new being said. Some ways forward identified. ■ agreeing to work on guidance material, potential for not flying MAPS in VFR, Safety Case and Pilot Brief update to reflect developments so some progress.

■ – Agreed to develop Pilot Brief to be more detailed about local glider activities. **ACTION** ■

■ – approval decision will progress, but minutes will reflect actions and progress made towards improvements Actions will require to be developed. ■ will support this.

■ – Reminder of updates required to other documents/sources such as Skydemon

■ **Brief** LEA MAPs affect Rufforth West. Agreed that utilisation is predicated upon poor weather operations and that needs to be covered better in Safety Case that risk is low. Question - if using an LEA PPR slot and VFR conditions exist can LEA cancel the IAP slot?

■ – no, some operators require it (NETJETs for example) as part of their AOC risk assessment for flight they must fly IAP if available.

■ – AOC must carry-out risk assessment and use of IAP is used as a mitigation by them.

YGC sympathetic to the requirements and application being made by LEA, but feel they are being required to apply a template which does not fit this uncontrolled environment.

■ – Asked for alternative suggestions

■ - Simplest answer would be a turn-back MAP, as used by Gloucestershire Airfield, Staverton (GLO). This was immediately rebuffed on the basis of the ground- based navigation

beacon availability at GLO for their purpose. There are published examples where a turn back can be made to an RNAV waypoint, such as the MAP at Kigali etc but these options have not been considered.

Can't publish that a MAP may be unsafe, but unlikely to be used. Unworkable for Rufforth West to manage exclusion from large piece of airspace for extended period of time for IAP to be flown and potential MAP to be taken into account.

█ – Clarified that original premise of proposed LoA that other airborne activity would exclude itself from a defined dimension of airspace relative to the track of the IAP is not to be pursued and would not be accepted by the CAA as appropriate to Class G operations and compatibility with the nature of the airspace. LoAs must use communication and mutually agreeable actions to promote safety – not impose exclusions on other airspace users.

Could a turn-back procedure be use?

Discussion that it would be ideal, but not currently supported because legacy GPS equipment does not permit accurate capture and flight of the tighter turns.

█ Procedure design change would not be a viable proposition as it would require a complete ACP re-start. New equipment would be ok but not legacy equipment.

YGC concern remains the proximity of the CAT A & B, CAT C & D MAPs to their local soaring area, particularly concerned about the potential for many young/inexperienced glider pilots flying in area.

Summarisation/AOB

Briefings and discussions occurred concurrently rather than successively as proposed on the agenda. Some areas of concern/disagreement still difficult to resolve, particularly regarding CAT C & D operations, but some positive improvement actions identified and all parties willing to continue working together and to try and develop mutually agreeable procedures.

ALL STAKEHOLDERS – continue working together to try and develop and agree LoAs, including areas discussed and agreed at the meeting, such as VFR routings for MAPs conducted by training flights, communication procedures and sharing of information. **ACTION ALL STAKEHOLDERS**

█ – Asked to understand placement of meeting in decision-making process. Burden of documentation update.

█ – Explained that decision making process will continue as this is a supporting activity to try and ensure that working relationships between stakeholders in the area are viable and that there is an opportunity to explore ways of improvement. Meeting minutes will be considered as will any actions arising. If any actions agreed to be undertaken are not completed by the time of any implementation but are considered essential it is possible for the implementation to be suspended by NOTAM until satisfactory completion of the action, although this is not ideal. Any documents submitted already are now those that are being considered as the Stage 5 submission, but this does not affect the sponsor from offering further updates to documentation.

█ – Suggested arranging a meeting between █ to gain a better understanding of glider operating restrictions. **ACTION █**.

The three independent meeting attendees were asked for their comments:

█ – Sponsors have cost implications associated with the management of IAPs and they want them to work and to work with other stakeholders to achieve this. They are not intended for unrestricted use at any time now or in the future.

█ – Thanks for opportunity to attend meeting. BGA supportive of the GNSS programme and understand the safety benefits, but just need to ensure that they don't restrict airspace for other users.

■ – Constructive meeting. But PANS Ops is too restrictive, and we need to establish ways of being more flexible with procedure design. Electronic FIDs needed!

The Chair thanked everyone for their contributions, participation in a productive meeting and asked that everyone keep working together.

■ - Actions reviewed and agreed.

Actions:

■: Broader issues raised at meeting where CAA action/policy can be an influence are taken forward to the CAA by the FT.

■: Send published information about use of FIDS by FISOs to ■ and pursue issue of use of FIDS by AGCS with AAA Policy.

■■■■ Work together to create a joint fixed wing/glider briefing document and set of simple procedures to give guidance to pilots intending to transit the LEA/SAC area.

■: To provide contact details for SATCO Gloucester Airport to ■.

■: Pursue CAA publication of general information about RNP at Class G airfields and guidance on flying through those areas and work with ■■■■■ after their guidance document is completed to identify if that document could contribute to that guidance and become a template for any future similar ACP applications.

■ Check heights on IAPs in respect of CDA with APDO.

■ Update Pilot Briefs to include more detailed information about the location and nature of local aviation stakeholder activity, particularly gliding activity.

■ Arrange meeting to discuss and gain understanding of glider operations restrictions.

ALL STAKEHOLDERS: Continue working together to try and develop and agree LoAs, including areas discussed and agreed at the meeting.