



Airspace Change Proposal

ACP -2015 – 04

RNP

Instrument Approach Procedures


POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW

25th March 2025

Document Control

Reference	Description
Document Title	Post Implementation Review Document
	Sherburn RNP ACP
Document Ref	ACP – 2015-04
Issue	Issue 1.0
Date	25 th March 2025
Name	Sherburn-in-Elmet Aero Club
Classification	Public (Once redacted)

Issue	Amendment	Date
Issue 1.0	First draft	25 th March 2025

Approval Level	Authority	Name
Author	Head of Training	

Contents

1	Introduction
2	Background
3	The PIR Process
4	Responses to Data Requests
5	General Observations
6	Safety Data
7	Service Provision/resource issues
8	Traffic Figure
9	Operational Feedback
10	Utilisation of SIDs/STARs/IAPs
11	Letters of Agreement
12	Impact on MOD Operations
13	Stakeholder Feedback
14	Other Information of Relevance
15	Conclusion

Appendices

Appendix 1 PIR Data request document

Appendix 2 CAP 2388 Airspace Change Decision – Conditions

Appendix 3 RNP usage statistics

Annexes (as separate files)

Annex 1 Stakeholder Feedback

Annex 2 RNP Feedback Forms

1. Introduction

1.1 This document, Appendices and Annexes have been created by SAC (the sponsor) in response to the request from CAA for data as part of the Post Implementation Review (PIR) of the twelve months operation of RNP IAPs approved by them in March 2023. This was detailed in CAP 2388 Airspace Change Decision – Full Reasons paragraph 54, 55 & 56.

Post Implementation Review

54. In accordance with the CAA standard procedures, the implications of the change will be reviewed after one full year of operation¹³, at which point, CAA staff will engage with interested parties to obtain feedback and data to contribute to the analysis.

55. The Sponsors will be sent a letter detailing the PIR requirements.

56. The PIR will follow the process set out in [CAP 1616](#). However, as this ACP decision was made under the former airspace change process, CAP 725, we will use the methodology that applied at the time of the original decision when assessing the expected impacts against the actual impacts. This means we will use the Secretary of State's [Air Navigation Guidance 2014](#), as agreed with the Department for Transport.

1.2 The format of this submission uses both qualitative statements and quantitative data to demonstrate support of the conclusions reached.

1.3 This PIR is not a review of the CAA's decision to approve the ACP nor a replay of the process leading up to it.

2. Background

2.1 The ACP process commenced under CAP725 with reference to ACP 2015-04

2.2 Finally a decision in favour was published 17th March 2023. Approval statement for implementation via AIRAC cycle 06/2023 on the 15th June 2023. Therefore, the review period is twelve months to 15th June 2024.

2.3 A full list of documents associated with the ACP can be found on the CAA website, with Sherburn-in-Elmet RNAV IAP's ACP-2015-04

3. The PIR Process

3.1 All successful ACPs whether conducted under CAP725 or CAP1616 have a Stage 7 PIR. In this particular case, irrespective of whether the CAA decision to approve the change was made under the previous process (set out in CAP725), all PIRs should normally be in accordance with the process requirement of CAP1616. However, when assessing the expected impacts against the actual impacts, the methodology adopted at the time of the original CAA decision has been used.

3.2 Once SAC's PIR data submission is published on the portal (CAA Website in this case), there will be a 28-day window during which any stakeholder may provide feedback about whether any impacts of the change are those expected, 12 months on.

3.3 Before the CAA can commence the PIR of an airspace change, the change sponsor must provide the CAA with a PIR submission that includes data pre-requested by the CAA. This data would normally be stipulated within the decision document at Stage 5 although this is not the case for changes pre-2018 (CAP 725). The PIR data request form [see Appendix 1] sets out that list of data required in order for the CAA to complete the PIR assessment. If required, the CAA may request data additionally to the data that was requested within the regulatory decision.

4. Responses to individual data requests

4.1 The following paragraphs set out the required data requests by topic followed by the sponsor's response [see Appendix 1 for the full document].

4.2 To link the responses to the PIR data request set out below, the relevant paragraphs from that document are shown in parentheses (). Not all the sections within the standard data request template require a response from SAC so only required responses are linked.

5. General Observations

5.1 (14) The following general observations are to enable an overview of the effectiveness of the airspace change.

5.2 (15) The change sponsor is required to submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.

5.3 (16) The CAA will review the analysis of the data submitted to ensure the anticipated impacts and benefits in the approved change were as expected.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	An overview statement on whether, in the change sponsor's view, the original proposal met the intended objectives as described on the	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	This ACP had a number of conditions attached, that require fulfilling post implementation:

	CAA's decision to approve the change.			c) The slot allocation system, as described in the documentation, must ensure that there is no possibility of aircraft being booked into EGCJ and Leeds East aerodrome (EGCM) concurrently and be aligned in terms local procedures concerning visual circuit occupancy. j) Following implementation, if the LoA with EGNM is withdrawn or amended, the impacts on the safety case are to be reviewed. The IAPs are to be suspended pending this review (NOTAM). If the EGCN airspace, as currently published, is re-notified the procedures are also to be suspending, pending a CAA review (NOTAM). k) Following implementation, the sponsor must ensure that they inform all pilots utilising the IAP to RWY 28 at EGCJ when they are aware of gliders operating from Burn GC. Should the sponsor determine that the risk of a mid-air collision (MAC) while flying either procedure is heightened due to increased glider activity, then the procedure(s) are to be suspended until such time as the activity is considered not to present a heightened risk. i) A pilot may not make an initial airborne request for a procedure slot, unless in an emergency (update pilot brief).
b)	On overview statement on whether, in the change sponsor's view, the original proposal met any conditions described on the CAA's decision to approve the change (if applicable).	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	
c)	Confirm that implementation occurred on the dates identified in the Decision Letter. If no implementation date was specified in the Decision, please state so.	NO	Narrative.	
d)	If there was a significant delay between the planned and actual implementation date, please provide an explanation.	NO	Narrative.	
e)	Identify whether any other issues of significance have occurred during the period 12 months after date of implementation ³ .	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	
f)	Other than normal promulgation activity (e.g. NOTAM, AIC etc.), identify what steps were undertaken to notify local aviation stakeholders that the airspace change was about to be implemented.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	

5.4 a) One of the main drivers for change SAC identified as an objective was to offer RNP approaches when Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) prevailed, to reduce landing risks. The implementation of the IAPs has seen successful landings over the first year that would have previously precluded such operations. Thus, the main objective has been met.

5.5 b) There were fifteen conditions attached to CAP 2388 the Decision – Full Reasons document. Four specific conditions, listed in the righthand table column above, had to be fulfilled after implementation viz **C, J, K & I**. These are reproduced below with comments indicating compliance: -

c. The slot allocation system, as described in the documentation (EGCJ/EGCM LoA), must ensure that there is no possibility of aircraft being booked into EGCJ and Leeds East aerodrome (EGCM) concurrently and be aligned in terms of local procedures concerning visual circuit occupancy.

From the start of civil operations at LEA there has always been good communications with Sherburn Aero Club. The LoA between the two set out slot allocation procedures which includes checking with the other party before allocating a slot. This system has operated without problems for the whole period.

J) Following implementation, if the LoA with EGNM is withdrawn or amended, the impacts on the safety case are to be reviewed. The IAPs are to be suspended pending this review (NOTAM). If the EGCN airspace, as currently published, is re-notified the procedures are also to be suspending, pending a CAA review (NOTAM).

The LofA with Leeds Bradford Airport has not been withdrawn since implementation of the SAC IAP. The SAC/LBA LoA (version 1.18) was last reviewed in March 2025 with no amendments made.

The EGCN [Doncaster] airspace stills remains deactivated.

k) Following implementation, the sponsor must ensure that they inform all pilots utilising the IAP to RWY 28 at EGJ when they are aware of gliders operating from Burn GC. Should the sponsor determine that the risk of a mid-air collision (MAC) while flying either procedure is heightened due to increased glider activity, then the procedure(s) are to be suspended until such time as the activity is considered not to present a heightened risk.

All pilots flying the IAP to both RWY 28 and RWY 10 are notified if Burn GC is active at or before reaching the Initial Approach Fix [IAF]. This is done using a SAC RNP A/G radio response template, ensuring the status of Burn GC never gets excluded.

The relationship between SAC and Burn GC has improved significantly over recent years and a long awaited LoA is now in place. BGC/SAC LoA Version 4 was agreed and signed in February 2025.

Due to several factors including weather, gliding activity in the region has not increased significantly. There have been no safety factors associated with MAC risks raised by the gliding community.

i) A pilot may not make an initial airborne request for a procedure slot, unless in an emergency (update pilot brief)

Pilot Brief Version 1.63(13/06/2024) states this.

Since the RNP went live SAC has received two non-emergency airborne requests, but both requests were denied as per our CAA approval.

5.6 e) There have been no changes introduced as a result of issues of significance during the first 12 months.

5.7 f) In the runup to start of operations, presentations were delivered to the local gliding community, SAC and LEA pilots, simulator demonstrations were given, updated information was placed on the SAC website, the Flying Reporter produced a RNP video

(YouTube), A5 sized reference cards depicting the two approaches were sent, as promised, to all local gliding clubs and GA magazines were informed.

6. Safety Data

6.1 (17) The following safety data is required to enable an assessment that the new airspace design is at least as safe as the original design, if not safer

6.2 (18) The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.

6.3 (19) The CAA will review the statistics submitted concerning these events and assess whether the revised airspace design is a contributory factor in any incidents which have occurred. If there have been no reported events, the sponsor should articulate this in their PIR submission.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Data concerning any recurring instances of Instrument Flight Procedures (IAPs, SIDs, STARs, Holds) not being flown correctly. ⁴	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by data (flight data).	As these procedures have been implemented in Class G airspace to reduce the risk of CFIT, it is vital that they are flown as approved.
b)	Report concerning any known Mandatory Occurrence Reports (MORs).	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative supported by copies of the original MOR Report(s).	
c)	Report concerning any known AIRPROX reports.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative supported by copies of the original AIRPROX Report(s).	
d)	Report concerning any known Air Safety Reports (ASR) ⁵ .	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative supported by copies of the original ASR Report(s).	

6.4 a) No data concerning any recurring instances of Instrument Flight Procedures not being flown correctly.

6.5 b) No reports concerning any known Mandatory Occurrence Reports (MORs)

6.6 c) No reports concerning any known AIRPROXs

6.7 d) No reports concerning any known Air Safety Reports (ASRs)

7. Service Provision/resource issues

7.1 (20) The change sponsor will need to demonstrate that adequate resources are in place to facilitate the operation of the new airspace design, and that air traffic services are being provided as forecast in the approved change without unanticipated negative impact on other airspace users.

7.2 (21) The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.

7.3 (22) The CAA will assess whether there is adequate resource in place to support the operation comparing the change sponsor's data with the approved change.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Data on refusals of service.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	This data will refer to how the 'slot system' at Sherburn-in-Elmet has worked or not and the impacts on VFR operations at Sherburn-in-Elmet.
b)	Data regarding air traffic delays.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	
c)	Details of additional resource allocated, considering daily and seasonal traffic patterns.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	

7.4 a) There have been no refusal of services recorded.

7.5 b) There have been no traffic delays notified.

7.6 c) No additional resources have been required

8. Traffic Figure

8.1 (29) Traffic figures over the period will give a general overview of the nature of the operation following the implementation of the change. In addition, where the change was predicated on a forecast increase in traffic numbers, the change sponsor will need to confirm whether or not the increase forecast in the approved change has been realised.

8.2 (30) The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.

8.3 (31) The CAA will consider the extent of any difference between the predicted and actual traffic figures and the extent to which the impacts of the change can be explained by those differences.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Data on the actual vs predicted figures including: 1) total number of aircraft movements 2) fleet mix or types of aircraft using the aerodrome	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	The sponsor stated that the IAPs would be shared with Leeds East Aerodrome and due to the slot system there would be a limit on the usage of the IAPs.
b)	Data on the % change compared monthly before and after the change.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	
c)	Reconfirmation that there have been no factors that would cause a material change to the traffic forecasts provided in support of the original proposal, i.e. that the original forecasts are still reasonable. ⁷	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	

8.4 a) 1) SAC forecast and actual movement table below.

Sherburn Movement Forecast									
	v1.3								
	<div>Date range</div>	<div>Notes</div>	<div>Total movement</div>	<div>VFR Movement</div>	<div>Forecast</div>	<div>Forecast</div>	<div>Total</div>	<div>*4</div>	<div>Average</div>
			<div>s PA</div>	<div>s PA</div>	<div>Actual RNP</div>	<div>VFR</div>	<div>Movements</div>	<div>% Additional</div>	<div>RNP per</div>
					<div>PA</div>	<div>Training PA</div>	<div>RNP</div>	<div>Movements</div>	<div>Day</div>
								<div>per day</div>	
	2021	*1	29000	29000					
	2022	*2	34000		108	576	684	1.4	1.9
	2023								
	2023	*3	35000		150	576	726	1.5	2.0
	2024								
	*1	2021 movements were curtailed due Covid restrictions, we would have expected 34,4000 movements							
	*2	RNP Approval assumed half way through 2022							
	*3	Growth at sherburn will be limited due to existing saturation of resources, size of fleet, weather conditions, & anticipated economic conditions							
	*4	The increase in movements does not include an existing 200 annual IMC Training Movements that currently take place under VFR, since these would operate regardless of the introduction of the							
	NOTES	An RNP Movement is an approach using one of the IAP's 20% of days are RNP active days (cloud base below 1200ft) Average RNP movements on RNP days 1.5 Average RNP movements on VFR days 2.0							

8.5 a) 2) The number of RNPs flown by Category of approach speed A and B are below.

Cat A	Cat B
30	0

8.6 c) The Formal Submission contained the Traffic Forecast as set out above. The actual movement figures turned out to be lower than forecast, so there are no factors that would materially cause a reconsideration of said forecast.

9. Operational Feedback

9.1 (35) The change sponsor will have to present any feedback directly received by aviation stakeholders operating in, or affected by, the revised airspace design.

9.2 (36) The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.

9.3 (37) The CAA will assess whether there have been any unforeseen or unintended operational impacts of the approved change.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Any direct feedback from airlines/ air traffic controllers relating to: 1) Any change in the final approach path of aircraft and flight behaviour between VFR and RNP GNSS approaches within 1 nm of Runways 10 and 28 2) Any changes in the altitude of aircraft using the RNP GNSS approaches to Runways 10 and 28 3) Any changes to areas overflown by the introduction of the RNP GNSS approaches to Runways 10 and 28	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative supported by a table showing the feed-back in relation to the change and explaining what the change sponsor has done to address the feed-back.	There is no commercial airline operating at Sherburn or any ATC; however, relevant feedback from the AGCS/O and relevant aerodrome personnel would be required.

9.4 a) 1) There have been no changes in behaviour within 1nm.
2) There have been no changes in altitude for the approaches
3) There have been no changes in areas overflown for the approaches.

9.5 b) Answer not required

10.0 Utilisation of SIDs/STARs/IAPs

10.1 (41) Information concerning the utilisation of the various procedures implemented as part of the change. The information may highlight areas of unforeseen consequence, for example where a particular procedure is being used more than anticipated with a subsequent impact.

10.2 (42) The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.

10.3 (43) The CAA will assess whether the utilisation data is other than expected.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Data on the % of flights that actually flew the procedure(s) vs the total number of flights (departing or arriving), compared for the relevant time periods before and after the change including:	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	This covers IAP utilisation and should be compared to the projections in the ACP.

10.4 a) See Appendix 3

1) From 15th June 2023 to 15th June 2024 there were 21872 movements recorded. In the same period 30 RNP slots were issued representing 0.14% of the total. There were also 27 training slots conducted in VMC under visual rules.

2) 1 missed approach was recorded resulting in a diversion; due to a low cloud base.

11. Letters of Agreement

11.1 (44) Where a Letter of Agreement detailing specific procedures was a specific condition of the CAA approval, the change sponsor will need to evidence the level of use of that agreement.

11.2 (45) The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.

11.3 (46) The CAA will assess whether the LoA is being utilised and that it is working as expected.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Evidence of usage of operational agreements between ANSPs and airspace users.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	Any issues with utilising the IAPs and any changes progressed as a result.
b)	Data concerning the activation/ utilisation of LoA procedures.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	

11.4 a) LoAs were agreed between SAC and the following entities: -

- Burn Gliding Club
- Garforth Airfield

- Leeds Bradford Airport
- Leeds East Airport
- National Police Air Service (Carr Gate)
- Yorkshire Air Ambulance (Nostell Priory)
- Doncaster Sheffield Airport – Subsequently Closed

None of the above have raised any concerns nor suggestions about the workings of their agreement.

11.5 b) See Annex 1 Stakeholder Feedback for copied of correspondence.

12. Impact on MOD operations

12.1 (53) The change sponsor will need to demonstrate that there has been no unforeseen impact on Ministry of Defence operations.

12.2 (54) The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.

12.3 (55) The CAA assesses whether there has been any unforeseen impact on the Ministry of Defence that would need rectifying.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Details on any feedback from Ministry of Defence.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	Any relevant feedback from the MoD.

12.4 a) As Leeming is the nearest operational RAF station to SAC it is informed whenever an RNP slot is allocated. The DSATCO confirmed that RNP approaches have not affected them in any way.

‘To the best of my knowledge we have seen no impact at all on our operations’

13. Stakeholder Feedback

13.1 (56) Feedback is needed to identify any issues from a community perspective that were not anticipated a part of the approved change; monthly data over the course of a year is needed so that seasonal traffic changes are taken into account.

13.2 (57) The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.

13.3 (58) A review is made by the CAA of the change sponsors conclusions in identifying any unforeseen or unintended impacts of the change.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Feedback/complaints received by the change sponsor and CAA in the period between implementation and post-implementation review.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	Relevant stakeholder feedback.
b)	Details of location of complaints.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Ordnance Survey map identifying pinned locations.	
c)	Feedback/complaints received via an FCS 1522 Form (UK Airspace Access or Refusal of ATS Report).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Copies of the FCS 1522 Form relevant to the PIR being conducted.	

13.4 a) In the run up to start of RNP operations communications with some stakeholders had been established. During the initial few months of operations SAC reached out to those stakeholders who were more closely involved with day-to-day operations. No complaints were received, and feedback can be found in Annex 1 Stakeholder Feedback [Published as a separate document and redacted for upload to the portal].

13.5 b) There have been no complaints received.

13.6 c) Answer not required.

14. Other information of relevance (if appropriate)

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Slot sharing system with Leeds East Aerodrome. Assurance that comms and timed deconflictions are working as planned.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative and supporting data.	
b)	Confirmation that there is no consequential change in the environmental impact of aircraft utilising other aerodromes.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative and supporting data.	

14.1 a) The mobile phones, email system and the (beta) online booking system have all been working well over the period. LEA has been very co-operative, and the system works very well.

14.2 b) As there has been no reports of changes to traffic at other airports because of these approaches it follows there will have been no environmental impact there either.

14.3 As can be read above in para 8. Traffic Figures (page 9) these forecasted figures have not been met due to several factors of which economic downturn is but one. As a result, there has not been a consequential change in the environmental impact of aircraft utilising SAC.

15. Conclusion

15.1 The Sponsor believes that the contents of this review demonstrate that the first year of RNP IAP operations has been safely and successfully introduced and that no changes are necessary to the instrument approach procedures.

Appendix 1 PIR Data Request Document

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group



Airspace Change Process Post Implementation Review Data Request

ACP Project Reference:	ACP-2015-04		
Title of Airspace Change:	Sherburn-in-Elmet IAPs		
Change Sponsor:	Sherburn-in-Elmet Aero Club		
CAA Decision Document:	CAP2388		
CAA Decision Date:	17 Mar 23	AIRAC Date(s):	15 Jun 23
PIR Data Submission Requested:	Oct 23	PIR Data Submission Required by ¹ :	Nov 24

Contents

Introduction	2
What does this activity entail?	2
Data requests.....	2
Format of data.....	3
Instructions for the Change Sponsors	3
General Observations	3
Safety Data	4
Service provision/ resource issues.....	5
Utilisation of Continuous Climb Operations (CCO) and Continuous Descent Operations (CDO).....	6
Infringement statistics	6
Traffic figures (air transport movements)	6
Traffic dispersion comparisons	7
Operational Feedback.....	8
Denied Access	9
Utilisation of SIDs/STARs/IAPs.....	9
Letters of Agreement (LoAs).....	10
Impact on environmental factors (including noise)	10
Impact on International obligations	13
Impact on Ministry of Defence operations.....	14
Stakeholder feedback	14
Other information of relevance (if appropriate).....	14

¹ A 28-day period to collate the data is usually requested, however an extension to the 28-day response period may be granted if sufficiently justified.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Introduction

1. The CAA's airspace change process is a seven-stage mechanism that is set out in detail in CAP 1616. Stage 7 of this process is a Post Implementation Review (PIR) that normally begins one year after implementation of the change. The PIR is an assessment of whether the anticipated impacts and benefits in the approved change and published decision are as expected and where there are differences, what steps (if any) the CAA requires to be taken.
2. Irrespective of whether the CAA decision to approve the change was made under the previous process (set out in CAP 725), all PIRs should normally be in accordance with the process requirements of CAP1616. However, when assessing the expected impacts against the actual impacts, the methodology adopted at the time of the original CAA decision should be used.
3. Once the change sponsor's PIR data submission is published on the portal (CAA Website), there will be a 28-day window during which any stakeholder may provide any feedback when carrying out this review about whether the impacts of the change are those expected, 12 months on.

What does this activity entail?

4. Before the CAA can commence the PIR of an airspace change, the change sponsor must provide the CAA with a PIR submission that includes data pre-requested by the CAA. This data would normally be stipulated within the decision document at Stage 5 although this is not the case for changes pre-2018 (CAP 725). This PIR data request form sets out that list of data required in order for the CAA to complete the PIR assessment. If required, the CAA may request data additionally to the data that was requested within the regulatory decision.
5. This list is not exhaustive, and some requirements will not apply in every case. Where a data request is required, it will be clearly marked with a cross in the relevant 'Yes' field.

Data requests

6. Where the data illustrates impacts other than those anticipated, the change sponsor is to provide (and evidence) their analysis of why this is the case.
7. If certain data is unavailable or is disproportionately burdensome to provide, the CAA will consider any justifications explaining the reasons for not providing the data and the CAA may adjust the requirements on this basis. Additionally, the CAA reserves the right to follow up with additional requests for data throughout the review period.
8. Any other data that would provide evidence of other benefits or impacts should also be included in an appropriate format.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Format of data

9. The format of each data request required will be stipulated below in the associated column.
10. Where data is provided to the CAA as part of the change sponsor's PIR submission, it must be in a format that is consistent with, and comparable to, data provided as part of the original consultation and formal ACP, if possible. Scaling of the data should be consistent throughout to enable a like-for-like comparison.
11. The PIR submission must be in a suitable format for publishing onto the CAA's Airspace Portal.

Instructions for the Change Sponsors

12. The change sponsor is required to commence monitoring and gathering of data on the impacts of the change as soon as the change has been implemented². On receipt of this data request form, the change sponsor should begin to collate the data required, analyse each data request (summarising the conclusions of the analysis), and submit it via email to the assigned AR Project Officer in a Post Implementation Review Submission. The date on which the CAA requires the data to be submitted is stipulated at the top of this document.
13. If for any reason, the change sponsor is unable to support this data request at the time requested by the CAA, justification as to why must be submitted to the AR Project Officer. Such requests for a delay in submitting the data must be agreed with the CAA, including an agreement of an appropriate time that this activity can take place.

General Observations

14. The following general observations are to enable an overview of the effectiveness of the airspace change.
15. The change sponsor is required to submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
16. The CAA will review the analysis of the data submitted to ensure the anticipated impacts and benefits in the approved change were as expected.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	An overview statement on whether, in the change sponsor's view, the original proposal met the intended objectives as described on the	Yes☒	Narrative.	This ACP had a number of conditions attached, that require fulfilling post implementation:

² Subject to the impacts of COVID-19 pandemic: [Airspace Change Proposals Post-Implementation Reviews \(PIRs\) impacted by COVID 19 - Update February 2021](#)

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

	CAA's decision to approve the change.			<p>c) The slot allocation system, as described in the documentation, must ensure that there is no possibility of aircraft being booked into EGCJ and Leeds East aerodrome (EGCM) concurrently and be aligned in terms local procedures concerning visual circuit occupancy.</p> <p>j) Following implementation, if the LoA with EGNM is withdrawn or amended, the impacts on the safety case are to be reviewed. The IAPs are to be suspended pending this review (NOTAM). If the EGCN airspace, as currently published, is re-notified the procedures are also to be suspending, pending a CAA review (NOTAM).</p> <p>k) Following implementation, the sponsor must ensure that they inform all pilots utilising the IAP to RWY 28 at EGCJ when they are aware of gliders operating from Burn GC. Should the sponsor determine that the risk of a mid-air collision (MAC) while flying either procedure is heightened due to increased glider activity, then the procedure(s) are to be suspended until such time as the activity is considered not to present a heightened risk.</p> <p>l) A pilot may not make an initial airborne request for a procedure slot, unless in an emergency (update pilot brief).</p>
b)	On overview statement on whether, in the change sponsor's view, the original proposal met any conditions described on the CAA's decision to approve the change (if applicable).	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	
c)	Confirm that implementation occurred on the dates identified in the Decision Letter. If no implementation date was specified in the Decision, please state so.	NO	Narrative.	
d)	If there was a significant delay between the planned and actual implementation date, please provide an explanation.	NO	Narrative.	
e)	Identify whether any other issues of significance have occurred during the period 12 months after date of implementation ³ .	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	
f)	Other than normal promulgation activity (e.g. NOTAM, AIC etc.), identify what steps were undertaken to notify local aviation stakeholders that the airspace change was about to be implemented.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	

Safety Data

17. The following safety data is required to enable an assessment that the new airspace design is at least as safe as the original design, if not safer.
18. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
19. The CAA will review the statistics submitted concerning these events and assess whether the revised airspace design is a contributory factor in any incidents which have occurred. If there have been no reported events, the sponsor should articulate this in their PIR submission.

³ CAP 1616 Part 1 The Airspace Change Process: Paragraph 270.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Data concerning any recurring instances of Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs, SIDs, STARs, Holds) not being flown correctly. ⁴	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by data (flight data).	As these procedures have been implemented in Class G airspace to reduce the risk of CFIT, it is vital that they are flown as approved.
b)	Report concerning any known Mandatory Occurrence Reports (MORs).	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative supported by copies of the original MOR Report(s).	
c)	Report concerning any known AIRPROX reports.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative supported by copies of the original AIRPROX Report(s).	
d)	Report concerning any known Air Safety Reports (ASR) ⁵ .	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative supported by copies of the original ASR Report(s).	

Service provision/ resource issues

20. The change sponsor will need to demonstrate that adequate resources are in place to facilitate the operation of the new airspace design, and that air traffic services are being provided as forecast in the approved change without unanticipated negative impact on other airspace users.
21. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
22. The CAA will assess whether there is adequate resource in place to support the operation comparing the change sponsor's data with the approved change.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Data on refusals of service.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	This data will refer to how the 'slot system' at Sherburn-in-Elmet has worked or not and the impacts on VFR operations at Sherburn-in-Elmet.
b)	Data regarding air traffic delays.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	
c)	Details of additional resource allocated, considering daily and seasonal traffic patterns.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	

⁴ Any instances of IFPs not being flown correctly must be notified to the assigned CAA Project Officer.

⁵ This may include relevant reports submitted through CHIRP.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Utilisation of Continuous Climb Operations (CCO) and Continuous Descent Operations (CDO)

23. Where the original change cited improvements in CCO/CDO utilisation, the change sponsor will need to provide data to demonstrate any subsequent improvement.
24. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
25. The CAA will assess whether the anticipated benefit has been delivered by comparing the change sponsor's data against the approved change.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	The % of traffic achieving CCO and/or CDO, compared monthly before and after the change (e.g. comparing the month of July before and after the change).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (flight data).	

Infringement statistics

26. Where the revised airspace design changes the dimensions of controlled airspace, the change sponsor will need to provide an analysis of airspace infringements.
27. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
28. The CAA will assess whether the airspace design was a contributory factor in any increase in infringements⁶. Was an infringement risk identified in the approved change and has it been mitigated?

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Data on the % change in infringements, compared on a monthly basis before and after the change.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	

Traffic figures (air transport movements)

29. Traffic figures over the period will give a general overview of the nature of the operation following the implementation of the change. In addition, where the change was predicated on a forecast increase in traffic numbers, the change sponsor will need to confirm whether or not the increase forecast in the approved change has been realised.

⁶ A review of any relevant data from the CAA's safety intelligence database will also be conducted.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

30. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
31. The CAA will consider the extent of any difference between the predicted and actual traffic figures and the extent to which the impacts of the change can be explained by those differences.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Data on the actual vs predicted figures including: 1) total number of aircraft movements 2) fleet mix or types of aircraft using the aerodrome	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	The sponsor stated that the IAPs would be shared with Leeds East Aerodrome and due to the slot system there would be a limit on the usage of the IAPs.
b)	Data on the % change compared monthly before and after the change.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	
c)	Reconfirmation that there have been no factors that would cause a material change to the traffic forecasts provided in support of the original proposal, i.e. that the original forecasts are still reasonable. ⁷	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	

Traffic dispersion comparisons

32. It is necessary to establish whether aircraft are flying routes and/or utilising airspace forecast in the CAA's decision to approve the change. A key part of the CAA's post-implementation review will be to analyse the 'before and after' dispersal of aircraft to understand whether the new airspace design is being operated as anticipated.
33. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
34. The CAA will assess whether there have been any unforeseen or unintended operational impacts of the approved change.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Density plots that show concentration.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative supported by heat plots showing where aircraft have concentrated within the acceptable	

⁷ Includes the impacts of COVID-19 pandemic.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

			tolerances of the procedure design.	
b)	Lateral and vertical analysis.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative supported by traffic density plots, that shows aircraft dispersion along with height gained or lost for each plot.	
c)	Weather/MET impacts.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Should be considered if there was a significant weather event	
d)	Any changes to operating fleet mix.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	

Operational Feedback

35. The change sponsor will have to present any feedback directly received by aviation stakeholders operating in, or affected by, the revised airspace design.
36. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
37. The CAA will assess whether there have been any unforeseen or unintended operational impacts of the approved change.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Any direct feedback from airlines/ air traffic controllers relating to: 1) Any change in the final approach path of aircraft and flight behaviour between VFR and RNP GNSS approaches within 1 nm of Runways 10 and 28 2) Any changes in the altitude of aircraft using the RNP GNSS approaches to Runways 10 and 28 3) Any changes to areas overflown by the introduction of the RNP GNSS approaches to Runways 10 and 28	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative supported by a table showing the feed-back in relation to the change and explaining what the change sponsor has done to address the feed-back.	There is no commercial airline operating at Sherburn or any ATC; however, relevant feedback from the AGCS/O and relevant aerodrome personnel would be required.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

b)	Any additional feedback from relevant flight operation sub-committee (sub-group of airport consultative committee).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative supported by evidence of minutes or notes of actions from meetings.	
-----------	---	---	---	--

Denied Access

38. This links to service provision/resources mentioned above. The change sponsor should provide data on refusals of access to the revised airspace design and any underlying factors.
39. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
40. The CAA will assess whether other airspace users are being impacted other than as anticipated as a result of the change⁸.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Data concerning the refusals of access (month on month/ before and after the change).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by logged refusals. (table format).	
b)	Reasons for individual refusals of access.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by logged refusals. (table format).	

Utilisation of SIDs/STARs/IAPs

41. Information concerning the utilisation of the various procedures implemented as part of the change. The information may highlight areas of unforeseen consequence, for example where a particular procedure is being used more than anticipated with a subsequent impact.
42. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
43. The CAA will assess whether the utilisation data is other than expected.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Data on the % of flights that actually flew the procedure(s) vs the total number of flights (departing or arriving), compared for the relevant time periods before and after the change including:	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	This covers IAP utilisation and should be compared to the projections in the ACP.

⁸ A review of any relevant data from the CAA's safety intelligence database will also be conducted.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

1) number of RNP GNSS approaches to runways 10 and 28			
2) number of RNP GNSS missed approaches to runways 10 and 28			

Letters of Agreement (LoAs)

44. Where a Letter of Agreement detailing specific procedures was a specific condition of the CAA approval, the change sponsor will need to evidence the level of use of that agreement.
45. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
46. The CAA will assess whether the LoA is being utilised and that it is working as expected.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Evidence of usage of operational agreements between ANSPs and airspace users.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	Any issues with utilising the IAPs and any changes progressed as a result.
b)	Data concerning the activation/ utilisation of LoA procedures.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	

Impact on environmental factors (including noise)

47. Typically, change sponsors will undertake an updated assessment of the environmental impacts that informed the approved change proposal. This updated assessment will be informed by actual flight behaviours following implementation and presented in a comparable format to that used for the change proposal. All updated assessments must be consistent with those presented in the consultation and the submission to the CAA. When using data samples to represent periods of operation, sample periods after implementation must be comparable with any sample periods used before the change.

Depending on the scaling level of the change, updated assessments may include:

- Local air quality
- Noise
- Fuel and CO2 emissions
- Tranquillity
- Biodiversity

The change sponsor will have to either;

- Provide supporting evidence to confirm that the impacts presented in the approved airspace change proposal are as anticipated and the conclusions remain unchanged; or
- Undertake an updated assessment of the impacts presented in the airspace change

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

proposal using actual data collected post-implementation.

48. Should the change sponsor be required to undertake an updated assessment and depending on the scaling level, the change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
49. The CAA will review and assess the change sponsor's assessment and determine the extent to which the CAA agrees.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
Local Air Quality – required where:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> there is a change in aviation emissions (by volume or location) below 1,000 feet; and the location of the emissions is within or adjacent to an identified AQMA. 				
a)	Ambient air quality limit concentrations (in $\mu\text{g.m}^{-3}$).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative describing impact on AQMA with supporting concentration data (table format).	
b)	TAG Local Air Quality workbook outputs.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Workbook outputs (table format).	
c)	TAG Air Quality Valuation Workbook outputs.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Workbook outputs (table format).	
d)	Description of prediction model and version number.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	
e)	Supporting input data (for example movement logs).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	
Noise – required where:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a change which alters lateral aircraft tracks or dispersion, or changes aircraft height, below 7,000 feet (above mean sea level) over an inhabited area (Level 1). 				
f)	N60 (night-time) / N65 (daytime) contours.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise contour figures overlaid on Ordnance Survey maps (or similar).	
g)	Leq contours (down to 51 dB LAeq,16h / 45 dB LAeq,8h).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise contour figures overlaid on Ordnance Survey Maps (or similar).	
h)	Leq contour population counts (in thousands), area counts (in km ²) and noise sensitive area counts.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table format.	
i)	TAG Noise Workbook – Aviation outputs.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Workbook outputs (table format).	
j)	Operational diagrams (for example, radar track diagrams and track density diagrams).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Operational diagrams overlaid on Ordnance Survey maps (or similar).	
k)	Confirmation of CAA CAP 2091 noise modelling category.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	
l)	Description of prediction model and version number.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	
m)	Description of modelling assumptions, for example modal split, route utilisation and respite.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

n)	Supporting input data (for example movement logs).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	
Fuel and CO2 emissions:				
o)	Annual fuel and CO2 usage (tCO2).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table format.	If the anticipated impact for each data request is assessed as positive, a qualitative assessment against each of the required data requests supported by an explanation is adequate (narrative format).
p)	Per flight fuel and Co2 usage (tCO2).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table format.	
q)	TAG Greenhouse Gases Workbook outputs.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Workbook outputs (table format).	
r)	Supporting input data	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	
s)	Description of prediction model and version number.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	
Tranquillity:				
t)	Operational diagrams clearly identifying AONBs, National Parks, designated quiet areas and noise sensitive areas identified during Stage 1 (1B Design Principles).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative and Operational diagrams overlaid on Ordnance Survey maps (or similar).	
Biodiversity:				
u)	Assessment of biodiversity factors including those identified during Stage 1 (Step 1B Design Principles).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	

Impact on International obligations

50. The change sponsor will need to demonstrate that any international obligations identified at the time of the change have been discharged.

51. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.

52. The CAA assesses whether the obligations have been met.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Details on any feedback from operators or neighbouring States.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Impact on Ministry of Defence operations

53. The change sponsor will need to demonstrate that there has been no unforeseen impact on Ministry of Defence operations.
54. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
55. The CAA assesses whether there has been any unforeseen impact on the Ministry of Defence that would need rectifying.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Details on any feedback from Ministry of Defence.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative.	Any relevant feedback from the MoD.

Stakeholder feedback



56. Feedback is needed to identify any issues from a community perspective that were not anticipated a part of the approved change; monthly data over the course of a year is needed so that seasonal traffic changes are taken into account.
57. The change sponsor must collate the data requests below, analyse and submit a qualitative statement against each data request which supports the conclusion reached in each case.
58. A review is made by the CAA of the change sponsors conclusions in identifying any unforeseen or unintended impacts of the change.

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Feedback/complaints received by the change sponsor and CAA in the period between implementation and post-implementation review.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative evidenced by supporting data (table format).	Relevant stakeholder feedback.
b)	Details of location of complaints.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Ordnance Survey map identifying pinned locations.	
c)	Feedback/complaints received via an FCS 1522 Form (UK Airspace Access or Refusal of ATS Report).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Copies of the FCS 1522 Form relevant to the PIR being conducted.	

Other information of relevance (if appropriate)

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

		Required for the review?	Format of the data required.	Any information of relevance in support of the request.
a)	Slot sharing system with Leeds East Aerodrome. Assurance that comms and timed deconflictions are working as planned.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative and supporting data.	
b)	Confirmation that there is no consequential change in the environmental impact of aircraft utilising other aerodromes.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Narrative and supporting data.	

Airspace Regulation Project Officer	
Signed:	
Name:	
Date:	09/10/2023

END OF DOCUMENT

Appendix 2 CAP2388 Airspace Change Decision - Conditions

Summary of the decision made

3. The CAA has decided to approve the implementation of the RNP IAPs to runways 10 and 28 at EGCJ.
4. CAA's decision is made subject to the following conditions being met:
 - a. Prior to implementation, all the draft Letters of Agreement (LoAs), must be reviewed and accepted by the CAA.
 - b. Prior to implementation, the Sponsor must ensure that the documentation which refers to agreed procedures for air ground communication service officers (AGCS/Os) and pilots flying the procedures, is aligned with the AGCS phraseology in Chapter 4 of [CAP413](#).
 - c. The slot allocation system, as described in the documentation, must ensure that there is no possibility of aircraft being booked into EGCJ and Leeds East aerodrome (EGCM) concurrently and be aligned in terms local procedures concerning visual circuit occupancy.
 - d. Prior to implementation, all the mitigations to the hazards in the safety case are to be accepted by the operating authority and all outstanding controls/mitigations are to be in place.
 - e. Actions and instructions, proposed as mitigations in the safety case, must be completed and submitted for review at least 28 days prior to implementation of the change.

- f. On completion of the actions and instructions in condition [e], a further review of the hazards in the units SMS is to be completed.
- g. Prior to implementation, the designated operational coverage (DOC) for the Sherburn Radio frequency must adequately cover the geographical span of the procedures and align with the Pilot Brief (suitable communication infrastructure to be installed and tested.)
- h. Prior to implementation, the Frequency for EGNM is to be corrected (to 134.580) in the pilot brief (v1.53, published May 22).
- i. Prior to implementation, the PAPIs are to be set in accordance with the GP of the approved procedures.
- j. Following implementation, if the LoA with EGNM is withdrawn or amended, the impacts on the safety case are to be reviewed. The IAPs are to be suspended pending this review (NOTAM). If the EGCN airspace, as currently published, is re-notified the procedures are also to be suspending, pending a CAA review (NOTAM).
- k. Following implementation, the sponsor must ensure that they inform all pilots utilising the IAP to RWY 28 at EGJ when they are aware of gliders operating from Burn GC. Should the sponsor determine that the risk of a mid-air collision (MAC) while flying either procedure is heightened due to increased glider activity, then the procedure(s) are to be suspended until such time as the activity is considered not to present a heightened risk.
- l. A pilot may not make an initial airborne request for a procedure slot, unless in an emergency (update pilot brief).
- m. Prior to implementation, evidence of the publication of updated procedures and the completion of training for AGCS/Os, must be provided to the CAA ATS Inspector.
- n. Prior to implementation, procedures for EGJ should ensure that, in the event of a missed approach, EGCM is advised by telephone to assist in the management of potential conflicts.
- o. All periodic post monitoring reports, including performance against SPIs are submitted to the CAA for review

Appendix 3 RNP Usage statistics (15th June 2023 – 15th June 2024)

MONTH	ACTUAL DAYS RNP FLOWN	TOTAL NO. OF RNP FLOWN	TRAINING RNP	NON-TRAINING RNP	CAT A	CAT B	DIVERTED
JUN- 15	2	6	6	0	6	0	0
JUL	4	4	4	0	4	0	0
AUG	3	3	2	1	3	0	0
SEP	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
OCT	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
NOV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
JAN	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
FEB	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
MAR	6	6	5	1	6	0	0
APR	3	4	4	0	4	0	0
MAY	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
JUN-15	2	2	2	0	2	0	0
TOTAL	25	30	27	3	30	0	1