

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 April 2019 09:39  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Infringement numbers in the vicinity of Lee On Solent

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Hi [REDACTED]

I can confirm that statement is true.

Having reviewed the statistics I am confident that the overall increase in infringements of the Solent airspace during the PIR period is not directly attributable to the implementation of the Lee on Solent ATZ.

Cheers,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]  
GM (ATS) Southampton

[REDACTED]

NATS Control Tower Building,  
Southampton Airport,  
Hants, SO18 2NL  
[www.nats.co.uk](http://www.nats.co.uk)



---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 April 2019 08:44  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Infringement numbers in the vicinity of Lee On Solent

Good morning [REDACTED]

Thank you for your explanation of the apparent discrepancy in the numbers which you have now clarified.

To close off this issue it would be useful to me if you would provide a simple statement along the lines of you 'have reviewed the statistics and are confident that the overall increase in infringements of the Solent airspace during the PIR period is not directly attributable to the implementation of the Lee on Solent ATZ'. I will then quote that statement in my report.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Airspace Regulator (Coordination)  
Airspace, ATM and Aerodromes  
Safety and Airspace Regulation Group  
Civil Aviation Authority

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 April 2019 14:09  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Infringement numbers in the vicinity of Lee On Solent

Hi [REDACTED]

The 61% reflects the general increase in infringements seen in Solent airspace between the two year periods that you specified. The only reason to investigate further would be if you consider that the increase in infringements within the whole Solent airspace is potentially driven by the implementation of the Lee-on-Solent ATZ. I fail to see how this is possible, and would be at odds with your previous assessment that you're happy for us to be the arbiters of 'in the vicinity'.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]  
GM (ATS) Southampton

[REDACTED]

NATS Control Tower Building,  
Southampton Airport,  
Hants, SO18 2NL  
[www.nats.co.uk](http://www.nats.co.uk)



---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 01 April 2019 08:32  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Infringement numbers in the vicinity of Lee On Solent

Good morning [REDACTED]

I tend to agree that a percentage increase of 2% could be considered to be not significant. However what prompted my concern is the increase in actual number of infringements in the vicinity of the Lee on Solent ATZ from 18 in 2016 (i.e. before the ATZ was established) to 29 in the year following implementation.

That increase of 11 equates to an increase of approximately 61% (i.e. 11/18 = 61%). This would appear to be at odds with the very much smaller percentage increase (2%) when compared to the overall numbers, hence my questions to Neil.

I appreciate the burden of this additional work and the challenge it presents you with resource allocation. However I hope that you understand that the CAA must be seen to be rigorous when coming to its conclusions for the report, particularly as the likelihood of an increase infringements was mentioned in the Director's Decision letter.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 29 March 2019 17:51  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: Infringement numbers in the vicinity of Lee On Solent

Hello [Redacted]

I'm afraid I have to disagree with your assessment that there was a 'significant increase' in the number of infringements in the vicinity of Lee on Solent.

Our total infringements for a given year vary around the 100 mark (from circa 70 to 120 or more) from year to year. I haven't seen the numbers myself but Neil has advised that they within this order of magnitude (i.e. not 10 and not 1000). Therefore, taking 100 as an average, an increase of 2% (from 12.4% to 14.4%) represents approximately 2 infringements difference (mathematically, taking 100 as a base it could vary between 1.4 and 2.4). Given this, as a change it can't be considered to be anything more significant than natural variation in the occurrences. I find it impossible to draw any other conclusion from an extra 1 or 2 relative infringements.

In answer to your question about an alternative member of the team I'm afraid I simply don't have any one else qualified who I can release for the time that would be required. If you would like the information you have requested then we will endeavour to have it by the end of May, however I propose that you use the above analysis to reconsider your conclusions.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]



[Redacted]  
GM (ATS) Southampton

[Redacted]

NATS Control Tower Building,  
Southampton Airport,  
Hants, SO18 2NL  
[www.nats.co.uk](http://www.nats.co.uk)



---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 29 March 2019 17:33  
**To:** [Redacted]

Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Infringement numbers in the vicinity of Lee On Solent

Hi [REDACTED]

Thank you for the update.

I feel obliged to ask whether there is anyone else who could take on this task in your absence?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Airspace Regulator (Coordination)  
Airspace, ATM and Aerodromes  
Safety and Airspace Regulation Group  
Civil Aviation Authority

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 29 March 2019 15:48  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Infringement numbers in the vicinity of Lee On Solent

Hi [REDACTED]

I'm operational over the next 3 days so will not get the chance to spend the significant time this will take, I'm then on leave until the late April after that and have no Non OPS days on my return. So with that in mind I won't be able to supply this information until at the earliest Mid to late May.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 29 March 2019 15:17  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Infringement numbers in the vicinity of Lee On Solent

Thank you [REDACTED]

The significant increase in the number of infringements in the vicinity of Lee on Solent ATZ compared to percentage of overall infringements will need to be explained in the report.

- 1) Were mitigation measures established for other area of the Solent CTA/CTR that were not applicable in the vicinity of the Lee on Solent ATZ?
- 2) Would you please provide the statistics for the PIR period on a month by month basis (i.e. for the 12 months after implementation)?
- 3) Please provide the dates and MOR reference numbers for the 29 incidents reported in the PIR period (i.e. for the 12 months after implementation).
- 4) Did the upward trend continue in the year after the PIR period?

5) Would you please provide statistics for the year 29<sup>th</sup> November 2017 to 18<sup>th</sup> November 2018 in support of your answer to point 4) above.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Airspace Regulator (Coordination)  
Airspace, ATM and Aerodromes  
Safety and Airspace Regulation Group  
Civil Aviation Authority

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 29 March 2019 12:40  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Infringement numbers in the vicinity of Lee On Solent

Hi [Redacted]

Here are the number of infringements in the vicinity of Lee on Solent for the requested periods.

November 28<sup>th</sup> 2015 to November 27<sup>th</sup> 2016 – 18 which equates to approximately 12.4% of all our infringements during this time.

November 28<sup>th</sup> 2016 to November 28<sup>th</sup> 2017 – 29 which equates to approximately 14.4% of all our infringements during this time.

Hope these figures help with the PIR.

Kind Regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Unit Lead Investigator  
Unit MET Assessor

---

If you are not the intended recipient, please notify our Help Desk at Email [Information.Solutions@nats.co.uk](mailto:Information.Solutions@nats.co.uk) immediately. You should not copy or use this email or attachment(s) for any purpose nor disclose their contents to any other person.

NATS computer systems may be monitored and communications carried on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system.

Please note that neither NATS nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses or any losses caused as a result of viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

NATS means NATS (En Route) plc (company number: 4129273), NATS (Services) Ltd (company number 4129270), NATSNAV Ltd (company number: 4164590) or NATS Ltd (company number 3155567) or NATS

Holdings Ltd (company number 4138218). All companies are registered in England and their registered office is at 4000 Parkway, Whiteley, Fareham, Hampshire, PO15 7FL.

---

\*\*\*\*\*

Before Printing consider the environment. This e-mail and any attachment(s) are for authorised use by the intended recipient(s) only. It may contain proprietary material, confidential information and/or be subject to legal privilege. If you are not an intended recipient then please promptly delete this e-mail, as well as any associated attachment(s) and inform the sender. It should not be copied, disclosed to, retained or used by, any other party. Thank you. We cannot accept any liability for any loss or damage sustained as a result of software viruses. You must carry out such virus checking as is necessary before opening any attachment to this message. Please note that all e-mail messages sent to the Civil Aviation Authority are subject to monitoring / interception for lawful business.

\*\*\*\*\*