

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 1 of 18 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Title of Airspace Change Proposal | Lands End Airport Introduction of Area Navigation Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) (RNAV) Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) |
| Change Sponsor | Lands End Airport |
| AAA AR Project Leader | [REDACTED] |
| Case Study commencement date | 24 September 2015 |
| Case Study report as at | 2 February 2016 |

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 SARG 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 **not compliant** Red as part of the AR Project Leader's efficient project management.

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 2 of 18 |

| 1. | Justification for change and “Option Analysis” | Status |
|------------|---|---------------|
| 1.1 | <p>Is the explanation of the proposed change clear and understood?</p> <p>The proposal (sponsor Lands End Airport Isles of Scilly Steamship Company (ISSC)) aims to introduce GNSS (RNAV) IAPs for each of the 4 runways (07-25, 16-34) at Lands End Airport. The Rwy 07 approach represents no change to the current visual flight procedures and is oversea; this procedure has been introduced separately as outlined in CAP 1122. For the remaining 3 runways, Lands End Airport has followed the ACP Process as detailed in CAP 725 (CAA Guidance on the Application of the Airspace Change Process) in parallel with the CAP 1122 application, but with a shortened consultation period of 8-weeks. This was considered acceptable, given the negligible operational and environmental impacts of these particular procedures.</p> <p>Introduction of these new procedures is the final stage of an extensive development programme at Lands End Airport. ISSC has provided a vital link to the Scilly Isles for nearly 100 years and the introduction of GNSS (RNAV) IAPs will improve the resilience of the service to the island-based community and visitors. The proposal is not intended to support a growth in capacity or service changes. It is intended only to support the requirement to improve service resilience against the effects of weather.</p> <p>The development of GNSS (RNAV) IAPs aligns with UK policy and the SESAR ATM Master Plan and is a cornerstone of the Future Airspace Strategy (FAS). The adoption of GNSS (RNAV) IAPs designed to PBN specifications will allow aircraft to follow more predictable flight paths, improve standardisation of flight profiles, enable flight crews to plan descents with more certainty and achieve more efficient descent profiles. The development of these new procedures demonstrates a slight move away from reliance on ground based navigation aids, in accordance with wider UK aviation strategic policy. ICAO Assembly Resolution A37-11 also stipulates that States complete a PBN implementation plan to support approach procedures with vertical guidance (APV) (Baro-VNAV and/or augmented GNSS), including LNAV-only minima, for all instrument runway ends, either as the primary approach or as a back-up for precision approaches by 2016.</p> | YES |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 3 of 18 |

| | | |
|------------|--|------------|
| 1.2 | <p>Are the reasons for the change stated and acceptable?</p> <p>The stated objectives are threefold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To ensure air services that provide a vital lifeline to the Isles of Scilly are more resilient and able to operate on a year-round basis. 2. To sustain the Isles of Scilly tourist industry; of paramount importance as it accounts for 85% of the islands' economic activity. 3. To be consistent with CAA policy regarding future implementation of new technologies stated in the CAA Future Airspace Strategy (FAS) for the United Kingdom 2011 to 2030, which envisions a future modernisation of the overall airspace system to enable more flexible and efficient use of UK airspace. <p>The introduction of these procedures is also the final stage of the Lands End Airport development programme.</p> | YES |
| 1.3 | <p>Have all appropriate alternative options been considered, including the 'do nothing' option?</p> <p>The do nothing option has been considered, but was discounted because it would:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“perpetuate a negative impact on the all-important tourism economy on the Isles of Scilly and prevent significant incremental benefits in terms of reliability and convenience being realised.”</i></p> <p>Taking no action would also perpetuate a number of detrimental effects to the Isles of Scilly population: These include lifeline services, tourism industry, essential and emergency supplies and an alternative to the ferry that does not operate during the winter. This service is essential in support of medical appointments and emergencies requiring treatment on the mainland.</p> <p>Several approach designs for one runway or all 4 runways (final solution) were considered, but not included in the formal proposal. Additional holds, east and west, were considered in the initial designs but discounted to avoid introducing additional overland holds close to Penzance, RNAS Culdrose and within the Isles of Scilly airspace. A simple cloud break procedure and offset approaches were also considered and discounted following advice provided by the CAA IFP designers. Avoiding over-flight of St Just on the Rwy 16 pattern was also considered, but judged not to be possible because of CAA regulatory and design limitations that ensure the maintenance of high levels of safety. However, the intention is to minimise the use of Rwy 16, when other options are available.</p> | YES |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 4 of 18 |

| | | |
|------------|--|---------------|
| 1.4 | Is the justification for the selection of the proposed option sound and acceptable? | YES |
| | <p>The proposed option to introduce GNSS (RNAV) IAPs to all 4 runways (Rwy 07 solely introduced in accordance with CAP 1122 guidance) is consistent with current CAA and governmental policy. The introduction of procedures on all 4 runways is assessed as the most suitable solution to mitigate risks to Lands End/ Isles of Scilly service resilience in Class G airspace.</p> <p>The ACP states that the change should deliver noise and emissions benefits. The ERCD environmental assessment states that: any major noise impact is unlikely; CO2 emissions are likely to remain neutral; there is unlikely to be any air quality impact; it is unlikely that there will be any impact on tranquillity or visual intrusion; there will be no impact on biodiversity.</p> | |
| 2. | Airspace Description and Operational Arrangements | Status |
| 2.1 | Is the type of proposed airspace clearly stated and understood? | YES |
| | <p>There is no proposed change to the class of airspace and no introduction of new airspace constructs.</p> | |
| 2.2 | Are the hours of operation of the airspace and any seasonal variations stated and acceptable? | N/A |
| | <p>Yes. The procedures will be available during the published hours of operation of the airport. The use of Land End airport is PPR only. Detailed guidance will be contained in MATS Part 2 and these procedures will be approved by the CAA as part of the IFP design and safety case assessments. It has been agreed that aircraft conducting GNSS (RNAV) IAPs at Lands End will be monitored by either Newquay Airport or RNAS Culdrose and LOA will be drafted. Specific SSR codes will be used.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 5 of 18 |

| 2.3 | <p>Is any interaction with adjacent domestic and international airspace structures stated and acceptable including an explanation of how connectivity is to be achieved? Has the agreement of adjacent States been secured in respect of High Seas airspace changes?</p> | YES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|----------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----------------|----|----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|
| | <p>There are no international airspace interaction issues. Operating arrangements between St Mary's Airport (Scilly Isles) and Lands End Airport will remain unchanged; these arrangements are the subject of an existing Letter of Agreement (LOA). A further agreement is being developed with RNAS Culdrose. Newquay Airport do not require a specific LOA.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.4 | <p>Is the supporting statistical evidence relevant and acceptable?</p> | YES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>Significantly, the proposal to introduce GNSS procedures is not intended to influence future growth in traffic volumes. Figures provided begin with a summary of total aircraft movements. The number of movements was lower during the period 2012-2014, due to poor weather (significant flooding) closing the runways. A runway hardening works programme has been completed and activity levels in 2015 are expected to be closer to the traditional average of 9,550 movements.</p> <p>It is expected that 10% (478) of arrivals will utilise GNSS procedures. These will be split between the runways in the proportions shown in the following table:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rwy</th> <th>GNSS Arrivals (%)</th> <th>Arrivals (Nos)</th> <th>Arrivals/ Day</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>07¹</td> <td>30</td> <td>143</td> <td>2.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25</td> <td>21</td> <td>100</td> <td>3.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16²</td> <td>18</td> <td>86</td> <td>4.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>34</td> <td>31</td> <td>148</td> <td>2.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The ACP states that the Rwy 07 GNSS approach will not change any aircraft flight tracks over the ground or the heights at which the aircraft fly, when compared to current visual procedures.</p> | | Rwy | GNSS Arrivals (%) | Arrivals (Nos) | Arrivals/ Day | 07 ¹ | 30 | 143 | 2.6 | 25 | 21 | 100 | 3.7 | 16 ² | 18 | 86 | 4.2 | 34 | 31 | 148 | 2.5 |
| Rwy | GNSS Arrivals (%) | Arrivals (Nos) | Arrivals/ Day | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 07 ¹ | 30 | 143 | 2.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | 21 | 100 | 3.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 ² | 18 | 86 | 4.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | 31 | 148 | 2.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

¹ This procedure will be introduced under CAP1122 and is therefore not subject to the shortened ACP process agreed for the other 3 runways.

² Procedure to be used sparingly due to overflight of St Just, if other options are available.

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 6 of 18 |

| | | |
|------------|--|------------|
| 2.5 | Is the analysis of the impact of the traffic mix on complexity and workload of operations complete and satisfactory? | YES |
| | The proposal is to introduce new GNSS (RNAV) IAPs that are not expected to increase traffic levels, traffic mix or operational workload. | |
| 2.6 | Are any draft Letters of Agreement and/ or Memoranda of Understanding included and, if so, do they contain the commitments to resolve ATS procedures (ATSD) and airspace management requirements? | YES |
| | The proposal is not expected to alter the existing agreements between Lands End and St Mary's Airport (Scilly Isles). Both units will continue to operate their respective sides of a 3nm radar separation 'buffer zone'. Some amendments to the existing LOA between St Marys, Scilly Isles and Lands End Airport will be made. This will detail how operations within the Lands End Transit Corridor (LETC) are conducted and take account of the new GNSS (RNAV) IAPs and enhanced ATCO ratings, to instrument standard, following recent training. However, it has also been agreed that Newquay and RNAS Culdrose will monitor approaches and appropriate LOAs are being developed. | |
| 2.7 | Should there be any other aviation activity (low flying, gliding, parachuting, microlight site etc) in the vicinity of the new airspace structure and no suitable operating agreements or ATC Procedures can be devised, what action has the sponsor carried out to resolve any conflicting interests? | N/A |
| | N/A | |
| 2.8 | Is the evidence that the Airspace Design is compliant with ICAO SARPs, Airspace Design & FUA regulations, and Eurocontrol Guidance satisfactory? | YES |
| | The draft procedures were designed by an appropriately authorised IFP design company (Davidson Ltd) and reviewed by SARG Airspace IFP staff who considered the procedures to be compliant with ICAO Doc 8168 Vol II. Whilst the final designs will be subject to review by SARG Airspace Regulation IFP designers, no issues are currently anticipated that might prevent the endorsement of this proposal. | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 7 of 18 |

| | | |
|------|--|------------|
| 2.9 | Is the proposed airspace classification stated and justification for that classification acceptable? | N/A |
| | There is no proposed change to airspace classification. | |
| 2.10 | Within the constraints of safety and efficiency, does the airspace classification permit access to as many classes of user as practicable? | YES |
| | This ACP entails no change in the airspace classification and consequently no acft are excluded from this area. However acft entering the ATZ must be cleared to do so (in accordance with Rule 11, Rules of the Air Regulations 2015) by the appropriate ATC agency if intending to conduct an approach or transit the ATZ. | |
| 2.11 | Is there assurance, as far as practicable, against unauthorised incursions? (This is usually done through the classification and promulgation) | N/A |
| | N/A | |
| 2.12 | Is there a commitment to allow access to all airspace users seeking a transit through controlled airspace as per the classification, or in the event of such a request being denied, a service around the affected area? | YES |
| | The ACP involves no new airspace structure or controlled airspace. Arrangements for transiting a Class G ATZ are already well publicized. | |
| 2.13 | Are appropriate arrangements for transiting aircraft in place in accordance with stated commitments? | YES |
| | The proposal will not introduce any changes that affect how aircraft transit through Class G airspace and the Lands End ATZ. Any aircraft intending to transit the Land End Transit Corridor are requested to contact St Mary's ATC or Lands End ATC a minimum of 10nm before the corridor boundary, as stipulated in the UK IAIP at AD2-EGHC-1. | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 8 of 18 |

| | | |
|------|--|------------|
| 2.14 | Are any airspace user group's requirements not met? | NO |
| | No. | |
| 2.15 | Is any delegation of ATS justified and acceptable? (If yes, refer to Delegated ATS Procedure). | N/A |
| | Not applicable. | |
| 2.16 | Is the airspace structure of sufficient dimensions with regard to expected aircraft navigation performance and manoeuvrability to contain horizontal and vertical flight activity (including holding patterns) and associated protected areas in both radar and non-radar environments? | YES |
| | No change to existing Controlled Airspace (CAS) or other airspace structures. The procedures themselves are the subject of an operational assessment currently underway by the AR IFP designers. | |
| 2.17 | Have all safety buffer requirements (or mitigation of these) been identified and described satisfactorily (to be in accordance with the agreed parameters or show acceptable mitigation)? (Refer to buffer policy letter). | N/A |
| | Not applicable. | |
| 2.18 | Do ATC procedures ensure the maintenance of prescribed separation between traffic inside a new airspace structure and traffic within existing adjacent or other new airspace structures? | YES |
| | The ACP involves no new airspace structures. The new approach procedures involve corresponding ATC procedure changes. Letters of Agreement have been refreshed with St Marys for the Land End Transit Corridor, and RNAS Culdrose. | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 9 of 18 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|---------------|
| 2.19 | Is the airspace structure designed to ensure that adequate and appropriate terrain clearance can be readily applied within and adjacent to the proposed airspace? | YES |
| | The ACP involves no new airspace structure. The existing airspace structure and the GNSS (RNAV) IAPs will necessarily take into account terrain clearance issues and are currently under assessment by AR IFP Designers. | |
| 2.20 | If the new structure lies close to another airspace structure or overlaps an associated airspace structure, have appropriate operating arrangements been agreed? | YES |
| | Negotiations are ongoing with RNAS Culdrose and Newquay Airport ATC to integrate these procedures into the local area. | |
| 2.21 | Where terminal and en-route structures adjoin, is the effective integration of departure and arrival routes achieved? | N/A |
| | Not applicable. The ACP involves no new airspace structure. | |
| 3. | Supporting Resources and CNS Infrastructure | Status |
| 3.1 | Is the evidence of supporting CNS infrastructure together with availability and contingency procedures complete and acceptable? The following are to be satisfied: | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communication: Is the evidence of communications infrastructure including RT coverage together with availability and contingency procedures complete and acceptable? Has this frequency been agreed with AAA Infrastructure? | YES |
| | There are no new communications infrastructure requirements. The proposed routes are contained within the lateral dimensions of airspace currently populated with routes where radar and R/T coverage is well proven. The allocated Land End Designated Operational Coverage (DOC) will encompass all the new procedures without further investment in communications infrastructure. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Navigation: Is there sufficient accurate navigational guidance based on in-line VOR or NDB or by approved RNAV derived sources, to contain the aircraft within the route to the published RNP value in accordance with ICAO/ Eurocontrol Standards? Eg. Navaids – has coverage assessment been made eg. a DEMETER report, and if so, is it satisfactory? | YES |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 10 of 18 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------|--|--|
| | <p>The procedures were designed by an appropriately authorised IFP design company (Davidson Ltd) and reviewed by SARG AR IFP Designers who will ensure the procedures are compliant with ICAO Doc 8168 Vol II. Clearly the goal of this ACP is linked to a move away from a ground based infrastructure and therefore there is no dependency on ground-based navigation installations.</p> | | | | |
| | <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 85%;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Surveillance: Radar Provision – have radar diagrams been provided, and do they show that the ATS route / airspace structure can be supported? </td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center; background-color: #008000; color: white;">YES</td> </tr> </table> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Surveillance: Radar Provision – have radar diagrams been provided, and do they show that the ATS route / airspace structure can be supported? | YES | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Surveillance: Radar Provision – have radar diagrams been provided, and do they show that the ATS route / airspace structure can be supported? | YES | | | | |
| | <p>The proposed GNSS (RNAV) IAPs require no additional surveillance infrastructure, other than the provision of a dedicated Mode 3 SSR code. The proposed routes would be contained within airspace where radar and R/T coverage is well proven and the ATM system is demonstrably appropriate for the task.</p> | | | | |
| 3.2 | <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 85%;">Where appropriate, are there any indications of the resources to be applied, or a commitment to provide them, in line with current forecast traffic growths acceptable?</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <p>Not applicable. The proposal is not directly linked to any anticipated growth in traffic or to overcome complexity or efficiency issues at Lands End Airport. There are no resource implications.</p> </td> </tr> </table> | Where appropriate, are there any indications of the resources to be applied, or a commitment to provide them, in line with current forecast traffic growths acceptable? | N/A | <p>Not applicable. The proposal is not directly linked to any anticipated growth in traffic or to overcome complexity or efficiency issues at Lands End Airport. There are no resource implications.</p> | |
| Where appropriate, are there any indications of the resources to be applied, or a commitment to provide them, in line with current forecast traffic growths acceptable? | N/A | | | | |
| <p>Not applicable. The proposal is not directly linked to any anticipated growth in traffic or to overcome complexity or efficiency issues at Lands End Airport. There are no resource implications.</p> | | | | | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 11 of 18 |

| 4. | Maps/Charts/Diagrams | Status |
|-----|--|------------|
| 4.1 | <p>Is a diagram of the proposed airspace included in the proposal, clearly showing the dimensions and WGS84 coordinates? (We would expect sponsors to include clear maps and diagrams of the proposed airspace structure(s) – they do not have to accord with AC&D aeronautical cartographical standards (see CAP725), rather they should be clear and unambiguous and reflect precisely the narrative descriptions of the proposals. AC&D work would relate to regulatory consultation charts only).</p> | YES |
| | <p>Yes, where applicable. There is no associated requirement for new controlled airspace. Final versions of the procedure design charts will be produced by the sponsor and are currently under review by SARG AR IFP Designers.</p> | |
| 4.2 | <p>Do the charts clearly indicate the proposed airspace change?</p> | YES |
| | <p>There is no requirement for new airspace aeronautical charts. Draft design plates detailing the GNSS (RNAV) IAPs have been prepared by Davidson Ltd (DAL) and will be appropriately reviewed by SARG AR IFP Designers.</p> | |
| 4.3 | <p>Has the Change Sponsor identified AIP pages affected by the Change Proposal and provided a draft amendment?</p> | YES |
| | <p>Yes. Draft amendments have been identified and these amendments will be refined prior to submission for the appropriate AIRAC cycle.</p> | |
| 5. | Operational Impact | Status |
| 5.1 | <p>Is the Change Sponsor's analysis of the impact of the change on all airspace users, airfields and traffic levels, and evidence of mitigation of the effects of the change on any of these, complete and satisfactory? Consideration should be given to: a) Impact on IFR GAT, on OAT or on VFR general aviation traffic flow in or through the area.</p> | YES |
| | <p>No additional restrictions on non-participating aircraft will result from implementation of the proposed changes.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 12 of 18 |

| | | |
|------------|--|------------|
| | b) Impact on VFR Routes. | N/A |
| | The new GNSS (RNAV) IAPs are not linked to any related forecast growth in traffic volumes. There is no direct impact upon any existing VFR routes. | |
| | c) Consequential effects on procedures and capacity, ie on SIDS, STARS, holds. Details of existing or planned routes and holds. | YES |
| | Planned GNSS (RNAV) IAPs and holds are currently the subject of IFP assessment. The planned GNSS (RNAV) IAPs and holds are included as Appendices in the ACP Summary Letter that covers this case study. | |
| | d) Impact on Airfields and other specific activities within or adjacent to the proposed airspace. | NO |
| | Noting that there is no associated change to the structure of local airspace, the proposed GNSS (RNAV) IAPs do not have any impact on St Mary's, Isle of Scilly airport. A draft letter of agreement has been agreed with Culdrose and will be signed by both parties by end Jan 16. No such LOA was required by Newquay ATC; Newquay will just be a recipient of information already written into the Lands End local procedures. | |
| | e) Any flight planning restrictions and/ or route requirements. | N/A |
| | Nil. | |
| 5.2 | Does the Change Sponsor Consultation letter reflect the likely operational impact of the change? | YES |
| | Yes, the letter provided all the detail required and the consultation documentation fully reflected the proposed changes. | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 13 of 18 |

| 6. | Economic Impact | Status |
|------------|---|---------------|
| 6.1 | <p>Is a provisional economic impact assessment to all categories of operations and users likely to be affected by the change included and acceptable? (This may include any forecast capacity gains and the cost of any resultant additional track mileage).</p> <p>This proposal is aimed entirely at improving the economic fortunes of the Scilly Isles, where 85% of annual income is sourced from the islands tourism industry. Before the runway hardening programme was completed at Lands End, the Scilly Isles suffered during successive poor winters where flooding at Lands End Airport prevented the regular service operating between Lands End Airport and St Mary's Airport. The addition of new procedures will ensure the provision of a year-around service to the Scilly Isles that will only have a positive economic impact on the island communities.</p> | YES |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 14 of 18 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Case Study Conclusions – To be completed by SARG Project Leader | Yes/No |
| Has the Change Sponsor met the SARG Airspace Change Proposal requirements and Airspace Regulatory requirements above? | YES |

This ACP successfully develops a case to support the introduction of new GNSS (RNAV) IAPs. The implementation of these new procedures is necessary to improve the year-round resilience of services to the Scilly Isles; this proposal was not intended to support any anticipated air traffic growth. The sponsor has closely followed the agreed, shortened ACP requirement. Whilst compliant with all aspects of the airspace regulatory requirements, the stated environmental benefits have not been clearly demonstrated. However, there is a good case for accepting the sponsor's argument that the proposal is likely to have a neutral impact; at worst there could be a minor negative impact at St Just if the noise is perceptible.

The consultation exercise generated a good deal of support and, significantly, no objections.

Newquay Radar and RNAS Culdrose have agreed to monitor approaches and have appropriate R/T coverage. A dedicated SSR code will be utilised by Lands End traffic conducting these new approaches.

The IFP designs are expected to be fit for purpose and are not expected to impose additional limitations on non-participating aircraft. The safety case work has been completed by AAA (ATM) staffs. AAA (Aerodromes) do not anticipate any major issues that would prevent implementation of the proposed changes.

| Outstanding Issues | | |
|---------------------------|----------------|---|
| Serial | Issue | Action Required |
| 1 | New procedures | Completion of assessment and approval of new designs by CAA IFP Designers |
| 2 | Safety case | Completion of safety assessment by SARG, AAA, Aerodromes staff |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 15 of 18 |

| Additional Compliance Requirements (to be satisfied by Change Sponsor) | |
|---|---|
| Serial | Requirement |
| 1 | Lands End Airport to develop and maintain records that show statistical evidence supporting the utilisation of the subject GNSS (RNAV) IAPs on each runway. |
| 2 | Lands End Airport to investigate with Newquay and RNAS Culdrose if track dispersion charts can be produced for PIR purposes (currently work in progress). |

| Recommendations | Yes/No |
|---|---------------|
| Is the approval of the SoS for Transport required in respect of the Environmental Impact of the airspace change? | NO |
| No. | |
| Is the approval of the MoD required in respect of National Security issues surrounding the airspace change? | NO |
| No. | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 16 of 18 |

General Summary

The proposal to introduce GNSS approach procedures aligned closely to existing VFR routes, ensures that concentrations of inbound aircraft tracks between the Initial Approach Fix and touchdown (with associated Missed Approach Procedures) align closely to existing local traffic patterns. Additionally, these procedures will provide a greater degree of resilience to the services operated from Lands End to the Scilly Isles. This ACP has met with no operational or environmental objections. It is anticipated that the procedures will be used on only a limited number of occasions. Significantly, the proposal is not a prerequisite for growth in traffic numbers, requires no change to airspace classification and has no impact upon local area traffic not landing at Lands End.

Comments

This is one of the first ACPs developed to introduce GNSS (RNAV) IAP wholly within class G airspace. The SARG should anticipate many similar proposals in the near future, given FAS imperatives to harness the application of space-based aids.

Observations

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 17 of 18 |

| Operational Assessment Sign-off/Approvals | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------|
| | Name | Signature | Date |
| Operational Assessment completed by (AAA AR Project Leader) | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> Airspace Regulator (Technical) SARG AAA | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 40px;"></div> | 30 January 2016 |
| Operational Assessment approved by (Manager AR) | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 40px;"></div> | 10 March 2016 |
| Case Study Sign-off/Approvals | | | |
| | Name | Signature | Date |
| Case Study Assessment Conclusions approved by (Head AAA) | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 40px;"></div> | 22 March 2016 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | Safety and Airspace Regulation group | SARG 1C |
| Doc Type: | Annex C | Version: 1/2012 |
| Title: | Airspace Change Proposal Operational Assessment | Page 18 of 18 |

GDSR Comment/ Approval

A good ACP. APPROVED subject to seeing the appraisal of the 10 public responses

| Name | Signature | Date |
|---|---|-------------|
| Mark Swan Group Director SARG |  | 23 March 16 |