Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Airspace Change Process
Post Implementation Review Data Request (Scaled)

ACP Project Reference:	***ACP:2014-07***		
Title of Airspace Change:	Hawarden RMZ		
Change Sponsor:	Airbus Operations Ltd		
CAA Decision Document:	*https://www.caa.co.uk/media/xknjrjy0/hawarden-rmz-acp-regulatory-decision-document-redacted.pdf*		
CAA Decision Date:	17 Feb 2017	**AIRAC Date(s):**	30 Mar 2017
PIR Data Submission Requested:		**PIR Data Submission Required by:**	27 May 2022

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 CAP 1616. 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. Airspace Change Proposals can vary in size, scale and complexity, which has led the CAA to scale the PIR process appropriately. A PIR of Level 2 changes will be undertaken when it is proportionate to do so. For some changes, the CAA may proportionately reduce the extent of evidence and data required from the change sponsor or allow more flexibility in the format of the data required[1].

4. This data request form sets out that list of data required for the CAA to complete the assessment for a scaled PIR. On receipt of this data request form, the change sponsor should provide qualitative statements against each of the general observations listed below. The date on which the CAA requires the data to be submitted is stipulated at the top of this document.

[1] CAP 1616 – Para 294, 295 & Appendix H

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

General Observations

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

a) An overview statement on whether, in the change sponsor's view, the original proposal met the intended objectives as described on the CAA's decision to approve the change.
The aerodrome operator believes the RMZ to be a significant safety enhancement to the aerodrome operations and the surrounding airspace. Overall, the ATC staff at Hawarden consider that the RMZ meets its goals of providing a safe, known traffic environment without the constraints of controlled airspace. The size of the RMZ, particularly to the southwest has been highlighted as being potentially inadequate to provide effective protection for Rw 04 approaches. Hawarden ATC staff however believe that the RMZ meets the current design needs with consideration of all local operators and geographic constraints.
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).
The CAA were concerned that on implementation, the radar ATCO position could potentially become overloaded and to mitigate this concern, an additional Radar Director position was resourced to be used on an 'as required' basis to support the radar ATCO. To date, the additional Radar Director position has not been required for the management of RMZ transits.
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.
The Hawarden RMZ was implemented as planned on 30 March 2017.

d) If there was a significant delay between the planned and actual implementation date, please provide an explanation.
Not applicable
e) Identify whether any other issues of significance have occurred during the period 12 months after date of implementation.
Following implementation in March 2017, Hawarden ATC experienced an immediate spike in the number of MORs raised due to RMZ infringements, which were then reported through the ECCAIRs Portal. None of the infringement related reports resulted in serious safety events, such as AIRPROX reporting Although pilot error due to a lack of knowledge/understanding of the RMZ conditions and associated new procedures was a contributory factor, feedback from several aviation stakeholders suggested that the north-eastern boundary of the RMZ was too close to the Chester VRP. Following review of the Hawarden/Liverpool ATC LoA after the implementation of the RMZ, a 'buffer' was established with Liverpool, which allows Liverpool ATC controllers to cut the corner in the vicinity of the Chester VRP without requiring any coordination, with the purpose to reduce the frequency of infringements and preventing overloading their controllers and pilots by eliminating additional RT transmissions.
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.
All local aviation user groups were involved in the regional LAIT (local airspace infringement team) meetings. Hawarden also produced and promulgated a Hawarden Airport Aviation Safety guide, which provided comprehensive detail for all airspace users on the conditions associated with operating in an RMZ for both radio and non-radio equipped aircraft.
g) Feedback/complaints received from stakeholders, aviation stakeholders or the Ministry of Defence by the change sponsor in the period between implementation and post-implementation review (including feedback/complaints received via an FCS 1522 Form (UK Airspace Access or Refusal of ATS Report)).
A summary of the feedback received from general aviation (GA) in relation to the RMZ design and procedures, indicates most pilot feedback is positive and they believe the RMZ to be a suitable and effective structure. Some suggested that the boundaries interpreted on VFR charts need to depict more clearly to help reduce the potential for infringement. Overall, operators and adjacent ANSPs indicated that the Class G RMZ airspace configuration was generally acceptable. There have been no refusals of entry to the RMZ and no recorded data of any aviation and aircraft delays associated with the RMZ airspace structure.

Other information of relevance (if appropriate)

h) RMZ Infringements
The total number of RMZ infringements per annum has decreased significantly since 2017, suggesting that familiarity with the airspace and procedures has become more obvious to airspace users.
i) [Insert additional requirement #2]

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

For CAA use only

In providing a response for each general observation, please ensure that the 'status' column is completed using the following options and that they are colour coded accordingly:

YES • NO • PARTIALLY • N/A

A summary of any issues arising should be provided against each question in the appropriate text box.

General Observations	Status
a) Has the change sponsor indicated that the original proposal met the intended objectives as described on the CAA's decision to approve the change?	**Yes**
The Hawarden PIR report indicated that the unit were satisfied that the introduction of the RMZ met the objectives and created a known traffic environment, without the need for establishment of controlled airspace.	
b) Has the change sponsor indicated that the original proposal met any conditions described on the CAA's decision to approve the change (if applicable)?	**Yes**
The CAA's concern over the potential lack of resource to manage increased radio transmissions from local and itinerant transit traffic has not been realised. The additional Radar Director position was resourced but has been rarely used.	
c) Did the implementation occur on the date(s) identified in the Decision Letter?	**Yes**
The RMZ was implemented on the planned AIRAC date.	

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

General Observations	Status
d) Was there a significant delay between the planned and actual implementation date?	**N/A**
No	
e) Has there been any other issues of significance that occurred during the period 12 months after date of implementation?	**Partially**
The establishment of any new RMZ or TMZ leads to a transitional period where established and itinerant airspace users need time to adjust to the conditions associated with such an exclusive airspace structure, with related conditions.	
f) Other than normal promulgation activity (e.g., NOTAM, AIC etc.), were there any steps undertaken to notify local aviation stakeholders that the airspace change was about to be implemented?	**Yes**
As indicated by the sponsor, other airspace users were made aware of the proposed introduction of the RMZ through routine interaction and this was supplemented by the timely publication of the detailed Hawarden Aviation Safety Guide	
g) Were there any feedback/complaints received from stakeholders, aviation stakeholders or the Ministry of Defence by the change sponsor in the period between implementation and post-implementation review?	**Yes**
Feedback has indicated that although the airspace is detailed on VFR charts, it can be easily overlooked due to those other controlled airspace structures in the local area, detailed on a complex chart. In addition, the southwestern part of the RMZ, weather dependent, is sometimes difficult to relate to limited and distinct ground features.	

Other information of relevance (if appropriate)	Status
h) RMZ Infringements	**Yes**
Data indicates that the numbers have dropped considerably since the initial period after the RMZ was established. This information has been verified the CAA Infringements Team.	
i) [Insert additional requirement #2]	Choose an item.

reasons

General Summary and recommendation	
Based on the above, does the CAA Project Officer recommend that this concludes the PIR assessment for this ACP?	**Yes**

This Stage 7 project has been categorised as a Scaled PIR due to the fact there was no introduction of controlled airspace and in-house flight procedures have remained unchanged. Although the introduction of the RMZ has resulted in a fundamental change to the routine activities of local airspace users, the impact has been mitigated by effective and continued engagement with stakeholders and the publication of the user guide.

The initial rise in the numbers of infringement activity was as expected, but this has gradually moderated and both local airspace users and other transit GA and Military activities have become more familiar with the airspace and the basic conspicuity interaction required with the ANSP. Although situated in a very demanding airspace users' area of northwest England, supporting a ATS Terminal and en-route IFR traffic environment for both Manchester and Liverpool departures and arrivals, Hawarden RMZ is now well established within this busy transition area for many GA and military training flights.

However, feedback from recent LAIT (local airspace infringement team) meetings has suggested that as with the Lands End RMZ, the Hawarden RMZ AIP entry should also include a chart to show the details of the local airspace, including the RMZ. This has now been discussed with the CAA AIM team and appropriate action should now be progressed, thereby reducing further any associated airspace users flight risk in this demanding region.

In conclusion, I recommend that this PIR assessment is concluded.

Decision and Sign Off	
Based on the above, does the Decision Maker conclude that the PIR assessment for this ACP complete?	**Yes**

I concur with the detailed summary provided above and agree that the introduction of the RMZ has met the objective. Furthermore, I support the recommendation for the follow-up work to incorporate a chart into the AIP.

Signed:

Name: C W SCOTT

Manager Airspace Regulation/Principal Airspace Regulator (delete as applicable)

Date: **21/02/2024**