

	Safety and Airspace Regulation group	SARG 1D
Doc Type:	Annex D	Version: 1/2012
Title:	Airspace Change Proposal Consultation Assessment	Page 1 of 5

Title of Airspace Change Proposal	Land's End Airport GNSS Approaches
Change Sponsor	Land's End Airport (Isle of Scilly Steamship Company)
DAP Project Leader	██████████
Case Study commencement date	24 September 2015
Case Study report as at	22 December 2015

Instructions
<p>In providing a response for each question, please ensure that the 'Status' column is completed using the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No • Partially • N/A <p>To aid the DAP Project Leader's efficient Project Management it may be useful that each question is also highlighted accordingly to illustrate what is resolved (Green), not resolved (Amber) or not compliant (Red) as part of the DAP Project Leader's efficient project management.</p>

1.	Consultation Process	Status
1.1	Is the following information complete and satisfactory? <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. 	Yes Yes Yes No N/A N/A

	Safety and Airspace Regulation group	SARG 1D
Doc Type:	Annex D	Version: 1/2012
Title:	Airspace Change Proposal Consultation Assessment	Page 2 of 5

	<p>The lack of a tabular summary record detailing the actions taken by the Sponsor did not undermine the success of this particular consultation; given the scope of the proposal, it was a small-scale, targeted consultation and I am quite satisfied that the Consultation Summary Report itself provides a sufficient amount of information on which to assess the actions taken by the Sponsor during the process and therefore the effectiveness of this consultation.</p>	
1.2	<p>Were reasonable steps taken to ensure all necessary consultees actually received the information e.g. postal/e-mail/meeting fora?</p>	Yes
	<p>The consultation document was distributed via email to a list of 49 pre-determined consultees; the Sponsor also sent a letter to local residents that reside in the areas immediately surrounding the airport to advise them of the Proposal and to request their feedback on it. The Sponsor utilised a press-release on two separate occasions and distributed a number of posters (at locations under and adjacent to the proposed procedures) advertising a two-hour 'Drop-In' session that occurred on the evening of the 7 September; those in attendance were briefed on the Proposal and given the opportunity to discuss it face-to-face with airport representatives.</p>	
1.3	<p>What % of all operational consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p>	17% (6)
	<p>Of the pre-determined list of 49 consultees, 35 were 'operational'. The Sponsor received responses from a total of six (6) of the operational consultees during the course of the consultation, which equates to a response rate of 17%. Each of the operational consultees that responded confirmed that they supported the Proposal.</p>	
1.4	<p>What % of all environmental consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p>	50% (7)
	<p>Of the pre-determined list of 49 consultees, 14 were 'environmental'. The Sponsor received responses from a total of seven (7) of the environmental consultees, which equates to a response rate of 50%. Of the total number that responded, five (5) confirmed that they supported the Proposal, with two (2) making 'no comment' on it.</p>	

	Safety and Airspace Regulation group	SARG 1D
Doc Type:	Annex D	Version: 1/2012
Title:	Airspace Change Proposal Consultation Assessment	Page 3 of 5

1.5	Were reasonable steps taken to ensure as much substantive feedback was obtained from the consultees e.g. through follow-up letters/phone calls?	Yes
	<p>Whilst the Sponsor did not send a 'hastener' to NATMAC representatives, they have confirmed that the stakeholders that were 'most relevant/directly affected' by the proposals were encouraged to respond during the consultation and therefore I am satisfied that the Sponsor took reasonable steps to ensure that the 'most critical stakeholders' engaged with them as part of the consultation process.</p>	
1.6	Have all objections to the change proposal been resolved (or sufficiently mitigated)?	N/A
	<p>Although there were no objections to the proposal, the Sponsor has confirmed that it is their intention to enter into a Letter of Agreement with neighbouring air traffic control units (RNAS Culdrose, Newquay Cornwall airport and St Mary's airport) in response feedback received from them before and during the consultation. In doing so, the Sponsor has demonstrated their commitment to safeguarding the airspace for all parties and for ensuring that a safe, orderly and expeditious flow of air traffic exists.</p>	

Outstanding Issues		
Serial	Issue	Action Required

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

	Safety and Airspace Regulation group	SARG 1D
Doc Type:	Annex D	Version: 1/2012
Title:	Airspace Change Proposal Consultation Assessment	Page 4 of 5

Recommendations	Yes/No
Does the Consultation Report and associated material meet SARG requirements?	Yes
<p>Although the Sponsor's Consultation Summary Report lacked a referenced tabular summary record of actions taken during the consultation, I am satisfied that the text contained within it provides a comprehensive explanation of the way in which the consultation was managed and that an appropriate level of evidence was provided to justify the conclusions of the Sponsor.</p>	

General Summary
<p>I am satisfied that this consultation meets SARG regulatory requirements; although incomplete (there was no tabular summary of actions taken), the associated material was of a good standard and the Sponsor has provided evidence to demonstrate that they were pro-active in publicising the launch of the consultation to the 49 pre-identified stakeholders and a wider local audience through the use of press releases and posters that promoted a 'drop-in session'. Although the response rate for the operational consultees was low, the critical stakeholders did engage with the Sponsor during the consultation process.</p>
Comments
<p>Nil.</p>
Observations
<p>Nil.</p>

	Safety and Airspace Regulation group	SARG 1D
Doc Type:	Annex D	Version: 1/2012
Title:	Airspace Change Proposal Consultation Assessment	Page 5 of 5

Consultation Assessment Sign-off/Approvals			
	Name	Signature	Date
Consultation Assessment completed by (AR Representative)	██████████	██████████	22 December 2015
Consultation Assessment approved by (Manager AR)	██████████	██████████	10 March 2016

AAA Comment/ Approval		
Name	Signature	Date
██████████	██████████	22 March 2016