

AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSAL CONSULTATION ASSESSMENT

Title of Airspace Change Proposal	Swanwick Airspace Improvement Programme (AD1)
Change Sponsor	NATS
SARG Project Leader	[REDACTED]
Case Study commencement date	01/06/2017
Case Study report as at	19/07/2017

Instructions

In providing a response for each question, please ensure that the 'Status' column is completed using the following options:

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- N/A

To aid the DAP Project Leader's efficient Project Management it may be useful that each question is also highlighted accordingly to illustrate what is resolved (Green), **not resolved** (Amber) or **not compliant** (Red) as part of the DAP Project Leader's efficient project management.

1.	Consultation Process	Status
1.1	<p>Is the following information complete and satisfactory?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A copy of the original proposal upon which consultation was conducted. ▪ A copy of all correspondence sent by the sponsor to consultees during consultation. ▪ A copy of all correspondence received by the sponsor from consultees during consultation. ▪ A referenced tabular summary record of consultation actions. ▪ Details of and reasons for any changes to the original proposal as a result of the consultation. ▪ Details of further consultation conducted on any revised proposal. 	<p>Partial</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>N/A¹</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>

¹ See Executive Summary

	<p>Executive Summary</p> <p>The proposal was originally briefed to SARG by the sponsor on 17 August 2016. The sponsor was advised that the briefing did not constitute a Framework Briefing for the purposes of the Airspace Change Process and that a Case Officer had not been appointed at that time. It was noted from the briefing that the sponsor had made a number of assumptions concerning consultation and the level of stakeholder engagement required based on the characteristics of the proposal. Moreover, the consultation activity commenced before any formal briefing to the CAA and was not, therefore, validated in any sense by the regulator. A Framework Briefing was subsequently undertaken on 17 November 2016 where it was agreed that a formal consultation period would not be required; however, the following NATS assertions would need evidencing in NATS's formal submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing access to Danger Areas with AMC agreement that they can accommodate management of new CDRs (no MOD show stoppers). • No objection from HAL or GAL. • Support from operators. <p>It was noted that the proposed changes were above 7000ft and were contained within existing controlled airspace structures negating the need for consultation with environmental consultees and, in this case, NATMAC.</p> <p>The formal proposal was received on 18 April 2017 following a submission in December 2016 that was considered inadequate. Regrettably, further clarification was still required from the sponsor concerning the engagement that had been taken as that information was incomplete.</p> <p>The information was subsequently provided and forms the basis for this assessment.</p> <p>No feedback document to consultees has been produced by the sponsor.</p> <p>Extra resource was required to obtain the necessary material to undertake this assessment and the lack of any summary or analysis of the activity detracted from the proposal. The consultation activity was assessed as barely adequate despite this being a straightforward non-contentious proposal.</p>	Partially
1.2	<p>Were reasonable steps taken to ensure all necessary consultees actually received the information e.g. postal/e-mail/meeting fora?</p>	

	<p>The manner in which the engagement activity was undertaken appears haphazard and its presentation to the CAA initially incomplete. Evidence of engagement with airline operators was provided by way of minutes of the 'Lead Operator Carrier Panel #8' meeting of 22 November 2016, albeit when the proposal was still at the developmental stage.</p> <p>Further minutes from the Flight Efficiency Partnership meeting of 23 February 2107 was also presented, confirming that the airlines that attended were briefed on the proposal.</p> <p>At no point has the CAA received a formal stakeholder list and so it cannot be confirmed that all affected stakeholders had been identified</p>	Partially
1.3	<p>What % of all operational consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p> <p>The informal minutes of the 'Lead Operator Carrier Panel #8' meeting of 22 November 2016 contain the statement 'The airlines raised no specific objections to the proposal' although no individual correspondence from this stakeholder group has been submitted with the formal proposal.</p> <p>There was no stakeholder feedback referenced in the minutes of the Flight Efficiency Partnership meeting of 23 February 2017</p> <p>An audit trail was provided that confirmed that DAAATM had responded to the engagement with 'no objection'.</p> <p>An audit trail was provided that confirmed that HAL/GAL supported the proposal.</p>	Partially
1.4	<p>What % of all environmental consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p> <p>N/A</p>	N/A
1.5	<p>Were reasonable steps taken to ensure as much substantive feedback was obtained from the consultees e.g. through follow-up letters/phone calls?</p> <p>There is limited evidence to suggest that steps to secure substantive feedback from airlines. Requests included in e-mail exchanges between the sponsor and DAAATM, HAL and GAL confirm that feedback was sought in those cases.</p>	Partially
1.6	<p>Have all objections to the change proposal been resolved (or sufficiently mitigated)?</p>	N/A

	No objections to the proposal were apparent.
--	--


Outstanding Issues	
Serial	Issue
	N/A

Additional Compliance Requirements (to be satisfied by Change Sponsor)	
Serial	Requirement

Recommendations	Yes/No
<p>Does the Consultation Report and associated material meet SARG requirements?</p> <p>The sponsor has not submitted a consultation report, simply evidence of its engagement activity. The nature of the proposal lends itself to abbreviated consultation activity and, on balance, SARG requirement have been met; however, this outcome is marginal.</p>	Yes

General Summary	
The manner in which the engagement activity was undertaken appears haphazard, rushed and its presentation to the CAA incomplete. Extra resource was required to obtain the necessary material to undertake this assessment and the lack of any summary or analysis of the activity detracted from the proposal. The consultation activity was assessed as barely adequate despite this being a straightforward non-contentious proposal	
Comments	
The sponsor should be aware that the consultation activity verged on unacceptable and struggled to meet CAA regulatory requirements	
Observations	
N/A	

Consultation Assessment Sign-off/Approvals			
	Name	Signature	Date
Consultation Assessment completed by (Airspace Regulator (Coordination))	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	16/06/2017
Consultation Assessment approved by (Head AR)	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	20/07/2017

SARG Comment/Approval		
Approved		
Name M SWAN	Signature 	Date 25 July 2017

