

AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSAL CONSULTATION ASSESSMENT

Title of Airspace Change Proposal	LAMP 1a Module C (Network)
Change Sponsor	NATS
SARG Project Leader	██████████
Case Study commencement date	18/05/2015
Case Study report as at	09/07/2015

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>The format of this consultation was devised following a number of discussions between the CAA and NATS aimed at resolving issues that arose during the Terminal Control (TC) North consultation undertaken in 2008. The consultation was conceived to cover the network elements of the LAMP development and needed to address the issue of connectivity with the subsequent airport-level proposals associated with LAMP 1a. As a result it was accepted that rather than presenting a number of single line route options as had the case for TC N, consultation using swathes would be more productive. The rationale was that by asking those beneath each swathe to consider that the final route could lie anywhere in the swathe, valuable information could be gathered about the issues that could influence the final design. The concern being that presenting a number of discrete line options that would simply result in objections from those beneath.</p> <p>In agreeing to this method of consultation, advice was sought from The Consultation Institute (TCI). Whilst CAP 725 suggests that a number of options should be presented where possible, there is no specific requirement to offer individual discrete design options and it was considered that the swathe methodology indicated the possibility of a large number of design options within a given swathe. The only concern raised by TCI was that the consultation would become less effective in the event that the chosen swathes became unnecessarily wide.</p> <p>All individual responses to this consultation have been reviewed.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</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>	<p>Yes</p>

	<p>The sponsor contracted BAE Systems Applied Intelligence and Ipsos MORI to prepare and manage the consultation. Given the wide geographic area covered by the consultation and the desire to include members of the public in the consultation, there was a comprehensive programme of media notification undertaken by and on behalf of the sponsor.</p> <p>In total there were 156 media coverage items through the Consultation (either business to consumer that targeted a public audience, or business to business through trade publications that targeted a specific audience) which were split as follows:</p> <p>Broadcast - a total of 45 items broken down as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 TV items; • 33 radio items; <p>Print - 52 printed items; and</p> <p>Online - 59 items</p> <p>The regions covered by the media activity included Essex, Hampshire, Kent, Suffolk, Surrey and Sussex. There were also a number of parliamentary and collective briefings throughout the consultation period and the initial consultation report published in April 2014, provides compelling evidence that significant efforts were made to ensure that the consultation was promoted with both stakeholder groups and members of the public.</p>
1.3	<p>What % of all operational consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">49% (33)</p> <p>The sponsor identified 62 primary aviation stakeholders, but also notified aircraft operators and regional airports. This activity was supported by a CAA Information Notice advertising the consultation to the aviation industry. Of the 62 stakeholders, 33 responded. Given the large number of questions posed by the sponsor, there is no simple breakdown of support/objection amongst aviation stakeholders, but a variety of views were identified dependent on the aviation sector being represented. There was general airline support for the principle of point-merge and tacit support for the use of respite route from Gatwick users, although caveated by concerns of the possible loss of system efficiency caused by the use of sub-optimal routes to provide respite. GA concerns centred on the proliferation of controlled airspace, the classification of that controlled airspace (A vs C/D) and the perceived lack of opportunity to raise the base of controlled airspace.</p>
1.4	<p>What % of all environmental consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">51% (137)</p>

	<p>The sponsor identified 267 non-aviation stakeholders, of which 137 responded. As with the aviation response, a variety of views were identified rather than outright objection or support. Some stakeholder group were in favour of respite whilst others objected on the grounds that they were not overflown at that time and there was some reference to airport expansion. There was concern amongst some environmental stakeholders that changes to airspace boundaries would result in commercial air transport aircraft operating at lower levels.</p> <p>There were 883 responses from members of the public generally reflecting the views raised by the identified stakeholders.</p>	
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>Hastening e-mails were sent to stakeholders 2 weeks before the consultation concluded</p>	Yes
1.6	<p>Have all objections to the change proposal been resolved (or sufficiently mitigated)?</p> <p>The initial Feedback Report gave a comprehensive summary of the issues and concerns raised during the consultation. A subsequent 'Design Report following Consultation Feedback on Route Network (above 4000ft) over Sussex, Essex and Kent' was published detailing the NATS response to the issues raised by stakeholders. The NATS responses were reasonable and there was a clear rationale for the design options chosen for the final proposal.</p> <p>Additional consultation was undertaken in April 2015 concerning the lowering of controlled airspace over the sea to protect Southend operations (GEGMU STAR). ██████ responded with an objection to the establishment of additional Class A, mirroring their original objection during the first consultation. The impact on GA is dealt with in the Operational Report (Para 2.7).</p> <p>There was some criticism of the use of swathes by environmental stakeholders who felt that a further round of consultation once actual routes had been finalised would be appropriate. However, as the swathe methodology had been agreed during Framework activity, no further action was required on the part of the sponsor.</p>	Yes

Outstanding Issues

Serial	Issue	Action Required
N/A		

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

Recommendations	Yes/No
Does the Consultation Report and associated material meet SARG requirements?	Yes
<p>The consultation reports were of a high quality and met SARG requirements. The presentation of consultation data was complicated and, at times, confusing; some data was subsequently re-issued by the sponsor to make our analysis easier.</p>	

General Summary
<p>This was a very competent consultation that met SARG regulatory requirements. The swathe methodology used in an ACP consultation (that has been submitted to the CAA) appears to have met the aim of garnering a range of opinions rather than just simple declarations of support or opposition.</p>
Comments
<p>The use of BAE Systems Applied Intelligence and Ipsos MORI to prepare and manage the consultation resulted in a comprehensive analysis; however, the presentation of the data was in places complicated making it difficult and time-consuming to isolate individual responses referred to in the feedback literature.</p>

Observations

Consultation Assessment Sign-off/Approvals			
	Name	Signature	Date
Consultation Assessment completed by (Airspace Regulator (Coordination))			
Consultation Assessment approved by (Head of AR)			27/07/2015

GDSARG Comment/Approval		
Name	Signature	Date