

## Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Page 1 of 12

### Airspace Change Proposal - Operational Assessment

Version: 1.0/ 2016

<b>Title of Airspace Change Proposal</b>	<b>Amendment to the EAMTA</b>
<b>Change Sponsor</b>	<b>JFADT</b>
<b>SARG Project Leader</b>	<b>[REDACTED]</b>
<b>Case Study commencement date</b>	<b>1 November 2017</b>
<b>Case Study report as at</b>	<b>11 January 2018</b>
<b>File Reference</b>	<b>20170703-Amendment to the EAMTA</b>

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

## Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

1.	Justification for change and “Option Analysis”	Status
1.1	<p><b>Is the explanation of the proposed change clear and understood?</b></p> <p>The JFADT proposal, which has been incorporated into the SAIP AD 2 change project, seeks to amend the ASM process for the EAMTA to provide a flexible booking process for military users whilst enabling the airspace to be exploited by GAT when the airspace is not required by the MOD. To achieve this it is proposed that the EAMTA is split vertically into 2 parts with a DFL of FL285. The lower portion will be activated routinely by NOTAM without the need to book the airspace. The high area can be booked on request and will be activated and managed pre-tactically by the AMC. In addition the proposal increases the upper limit of the EAMTA (high) with the NWMTA (high), increasing it to FL660. The proposal also seeks to harmonise the routine activation of TRA 003 to the proposed times of the EAMTA (Low).</p>	YES
1.2	<p><b>Are the reasons for the change stated and acceptable?</b></p> <p>The reasons are clear as stated above. The proposal harmonises the ASM process for the EAMTA with ASM and FUA policy (CAP 740 and EC IR 2150/2005).</p>	YES
1.3	<p><b>Have all appropriate alternative options been considered, including the ‘do nothing’ option?</b></p> <p>Yes, the do nothing option was considered but it was discounted because it would not enable the flexible airspace sharing that the chosen option facilitates.</p>	YES
1.4	<p><b>Is the justification for the selection of the proposed option sound and acceptable?</b></p> <p>The justification is made primarily on the grounds of increasing the flight plan availability of CDRs that route through the EAMTA whilst maintaining a degree of flexibility for military users of the airspace. This is acceptable and through seeking to do this, no negative impacts have been identified in other related areas.</p>	YES

2.	Airspace Description and Operational Arrangements	Status
2.1	<p><b>Is the type of proposed airspace clearly stated and understood?</b></p> <p>Yes, the only significant change to the airspace design is to increase the upper level of the EAMTA from FL550 to FL660. The key stakeholders impacted by this change are NATS and the MOD, who have jointly contributed to the proposal through the JFADT.</p>	YES
2.2	<p><b>Are the hours of operation of the airspace and any seasonal variations stated and acceptable?</b></p>	YES

## Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

	The EAMTA is currently published as active in the AIP for set periods even when not being used by the military. Therefore the net result will be a reduction in the hours of activation for the upper volume of airspace which will benefit GAT in terms of CDR availability.	
<b>2.3</b>	<b>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?</b>	N/A
	N/A	
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Is the supporting statistical evidence relevant and acceptable?</b>	<b>YES</b>
	The statistics presented in the proposal suggest that approximately half of the flights that routed around the EAMTA in 2016 could have utilised the CDRs that interact with the EAMTA (P5, P144 and UM185) with a potential fuel saving of 180 tonnes. The Sponsor has acknowledged that the flight plan availability of P5, P144 and UM185 are also be dependent on the activation status of the EG D323 complex, which will reduce the availability of these routes and the savings identified in the proposal.	
<b>2.5</b>	<b>Is the analysis of the impact of the traffic mix on complexity and workload of operations complete and satisfactory?</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Yes, as stated above the impact will enable CDRs to be flight planned more often providing greater efficiencies to GAT. The MOD has stated that they are content with the proposal because the routine activation of the EAMTA (Low) maintains an acceptable degree of flexibility to utilise the airspace on an ad hoc basis.	
<b>2.6</b>	<b>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?</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Yes, the LoA outlines the ASM processes to be used to manage the revised EAMTA airspace.	
<b>2.7</b>	<b>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?</b>	N/A
	No such activities to affect.	
<b>2.8</b>	<b>Is the evidence that the Airspace Design is compliant with ICAO SARPs, Airspace Design &amp; FUA regulations, and Eurocontrol Guidance satisfactory?</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Yes, the proposed change enables the airspace to be managed in accordance with CAP 740 and EC IR 2150/2005.	

## Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

<b>2.9</b>	<b>Is the proposed airspace classification stated and justification for that classification acceptable?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	N/A – No change to the airspace classification.	
<b>2.10</b>	<b>Within the constraints of safety and efficiency, does the airspace classification permit access to as many classes of user as practicable?</b>	<b>YES</b>
	The proposal does not change the airspace classification; however, the proposal enables more efficient routes to be flight planned through the airspace.	
<b>2.11</b>	<b>Is there assurance, as far as practicable, against unauthorised incursions? (This is usually done through the classification and promulgation)</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Yes – EAMTA activity will be promulgated by NOTAM and the AUP/UUP. In addition the Swanwick Mil East Supervisor will retain the responsibility to tactically manage the EAMTA.	
<b>2.12</b>	<b>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?</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Yes - no change to Level 3 ASM, which will be provided by the Swanwick Mil East Supervisor.	
<b>2.13</b>	<b>Are appropriate arrangements for transiting aircraft in place in accordance with stated commitments?</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Yes – as above, no change to Level 3 ASM.	
<b>2.14</b>	<b>Are any airspace user group’s requirements not met?</b>	<b>NO</b>
	No. The MOD has stated that they are content with the proposal which will improve flight plannable access to the airspace for GAT.	
<b>2.15</b>	<b>Is any delegation of ATS justified and acceptable? (If yes, refer to Delegated ATS Procedure).</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	N/A.	
<b>2.16</b>	<b>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?</b>	<b>YES</b>

**Safety and Airspace Regulation Group**

	Yes – the lateral boundaries of the airspace will not change. The DFL enables the EAMTA (Low) to be routinely activated to accommodate military requirement while the EMATA (High) can be activated on request at D-1 which would enable increased use of the CDRs that interact with the airspace. The upper level will be increased to FL660 to meet military requirement.	
<b>2.17</b>	<b>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).</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Yes – the lateral buffer requirement remains extant and the vertical buffer is to be applied by the AMC.	
<b>2.18</b>	<b>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?</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Yes – no change.	
<b>2.19</b>	<b>Is the airspace structure designed to ensure that adequate and appropriate terrain clearance can be readily applied within and adjacent to the proposed airspace?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	N/A – the lower level of the proposed change is FL245.	
<b>2.20</b>	<b>If the new structure lies close to another airspace structure or overlaps an associated airspace structure, have appropriate operating arrangements been agreed?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	Yes, the proposal seeks to amend the activation times of TRA 003 to coincide with the routine activation times of the EAMTA (Low). The lower limit of the TRA is consistent with the DFL between Class G airspace and Class C airspace and therefore the only traffic impacted by this change will be under the control of the MOD or NATS; the joint Sponsor of the proposal.	
<b>2.21</b>	<b>Where terminal and en-route structures adjoin, is the effective integration of departure and arrival routes achieved?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	N/A	

**Safety and Airspace Regulation Group**

3.	Supporting Resources and CNS Infrastructure	Status
3.1	<p><b>Is the evidence of supporting CNS infrastructure together with availability and contingency procedures complete and acceptable? The following are to be satisfied:</b></p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Communication:</b> 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?</li> </ul>	N/A
	Already in place and no changes as a result of this proposal.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Navigation:</b> 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. Nav aids – has coverage assessment been made eg. a DEMETER report, and if so, is it satisfactory?</li> </ul>	N/A
	No change.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Surveillance:</b> Radar Provision – have radar diagrams been provided, and do they show that the ATS route / airspace structure can be supported?</li> </ul>	N/A
	No change.	
3.2	<p><b>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?</b></p>	YES
	<p>Yes – The Military Airspace Manager has confirmed that the MABCC have the capacity to manage the EAMTA airspace in accordance with CAP 740 and EC IR 2150/2005. In addition the draft LoA between NATS and Swanwick Mil specifies the responsibilities of each party and the actions to be taken should either be unable to comply with the agreement.</p>	

**Safety and Airspace Regulation Group**

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&amp;D aeronautical cartographical standards (see CAP725), rather they should be clear and unambiguous and reflect precisely the narrative descriptions of the proposals. AC&amp;D work would relate to regulatory consultation charts only).</p> <p>Yes, the only change in the raising of the vertical limit of the EAMTA and the addition of a DFL.</p>	YES
4.2	<p>Do the charts clearly indicate the proposed airspace change?</p> <p>Yes.</p>	YES
4.3	<p>Has the Change Sponsor identified AIP pages affected by the Change Proposal and provided a draft amendment?</p> <p>Yes.</p>	YES

## Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

5.	Operational Impact	Status
5.1	<p><b>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?</b>  <b>Consideration should be given to:</b></p> <p><b>a) Impact on IFR GAT, on OAT or on VFR general aviation traffic flow in or through the area.</b></p>	YES
	<p>Yes, the proposal will provide greater access to the airspace for GAT when the EAMTA is not being used whilst retaining a satisfactory degree of flexibility for the military.</p>	
	<p><b>b) Impact on VFR Routes.</b></p>	N/A
	<p>N/A.</p>	
	<p><b>c) Consequential effects on procedures and capacity, ie on SIDS, STARS, holds. Details of existing or planned routes and holds.</b></p>	YES
	<p>The proposal seeks to increase flight plan availability of P5, P144 and UM185.</p>	
	<p><b>d) Impact on Airfields and other specific activities within or adjacent to the proposed airspace.</b></p>	YES
	<p>The proposal seeks to amend the activation times of TRA 003 to align them to the proposed routine activation times of the EAMTA (Low). The primary stakeholders impacted by this change are the joint sponsors of the proposal.</p>	
	<p><b>e) Any flight planning restrictions and/ or route requirements.</b></p>	YES
	<p>Activating the EAMTA (High) by NOTAM will increase the opportunity for GAT to flight plan along the associated CDRs. Furthermore, routinely activating the EMATA (Low) by NOTAM will enable the airspace to be deactivated at ASM Level 1 for periods of known inactivity (national holidays etc).</p>	
5.2	<p><b>Does the Change Sponsor Consultation letter reflect the likely operational impact of the change?</b></p>	N/A
	<p>N/A. There is no further requirement for consultation because the 2 main stakeholders who provide ATS in the airspace concerned are the joint sponsors of the change proposal. In addition the proposal harmonises the ASM process of the EAMTA with ASM and FUA policy.</p>	



**Safety and Airspace Regulation Group**

6.	Economic Impact	Status
6.1	<p><b>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).</b></p> <p>This proposal aligns the EAMTA ASM process to UK ASM and FUA policy. These policies are designed to enable airspace to be used in the most efficient manner; thereby aiming to improve capacity and environmental and economic performance.</p>	<b>YES</b>

**Safety and Airspace Regulation Group**

<b>Case Study Conclusions – To be completed by SARG Project Leader</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
<b>Has the Change Sponsor met the SARG Airspace Change Proposal requirements and Airspace Regulatory requirements above?</b>	<b>YES</b>
<p>The Sponsor has provided an adequate proposal that fully articulates the proposed change.</p> <p>This proposal should improve the flight plan availability of the CDRs that interact with the EAMTA while enabling the military to maintain an appropriate degree of flexibility to utilise the EAMTA (Low). Furthermore the proposal establishes an effective a simple method to strategically manage the EAMTA (Low).</p>	

<b>Outstanding Issues</b>		
<b>Serial</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Action Required</b>
1	Nil	
2		

<b>Additional Compliance Requirements (to be satisfied by Change Sponsor)</b>	
<b>Serial</b>	<b>Requirement</b>
1	Record CDR availability statistics to enable effective analysis of the change.
2	Record the impact to military users of the EAMTA – times when they were unable to use the airspace where they would have been able to use it prior to the change.

**Safety and Airspace Regulation Group**

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	

**General Summary**

The proposal seeks to harmonise the management process of the EAMTA with ASM and FUA policy while considering the needs of military users of the airspace. It raises the upper level of the area to FL660 and introduces a DFL at FL285 to achieve the flexibility required by the MOD. The proposal has considered the interaction with associated CDRs and TRA 003.

**Comments & Observations**

Nil

**Safety and Airspace Regulation Group**

Operational Assessment Sign-off/ Approvals	Name	Signature	Date
Operational Assessment completed by:	[Redacted] AR Case Officer	[Redacted]	8 January 2018
Operational Assessment approved:	[Redacted] Mgr AR	[Redacted]	11 January 2018
Mgr AR Comments: No comment.			