

**INVERNESS ACP CAA REVIEW MEETING (Redacted) NoAs HELD AT AVIATION HOUSE,
GATWICK ON 9TH JULY 2019**

27 Aug 19

Distribution List
Attendees
W

Present	Appointment	Representing
	Principal Airspace Regulator	CAA (Chair)
	HIAL Manager	HIAL
	Inverness ATS	Inverness Airport (HIAL)
	Consultant (Osprey CSL)	Inverness Airport
	Airspace Regulation	CAA
	Airspace Regulator	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	Airspace (ATM)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Consultation)	CAA
	Consultant (Osprey CSL)	Inverness Airport

1. CAA Introduction and Opening (rationale)

The CAA Chair conducted the introductions and stated that the rationale for the meeting, bearing in mind that the Inverness Controlled Airspace (CAS) Airspace Change Proposal was 'frozen' in Stage 5 (Assessment), was to understand the current status of the ACP and discuss a way forward. The focus being a consultation update and addressing the needs of the local aviation stakeholders and how Highlands and Islands Airports Ltd (HIAL) intended to proceed to fulfil the requirements of the CAP725 airspace change process.

	ACTION
<p>Item 2 – ACP Overview</p> <p>Z updated the meeting in line with slides 3 & 6 of the attached. X reminded the meeting that the T-bar/Y-bar GNSS approaches were not required by CAA as part of the first consultation. There had been a number of CAA Case Officers for the consultation/proposal; as well as X (who is now being shadowed by Y), A and B. There were at that time issues about RAF Lossiemouth and Tain Range (both now fully support the proposal), the 'contiguous' nature of the Inverness proposed CAS and N560 (which had become Class E+ conspicuity airspace), resolved within the current NATS Prestwick/Inverness Letter of Agreement (LoA) and access arrangements for General Aviation.</p> <p>As well as X completing the operational assessment; Y is assessing the consultation and Airspace Regulator (Environment), the environmental assessment.</p>	
<p>Item 3 – Post Addendum Consultation Report Overview</p>	

X updated the meeting in line with slides 4, 5, 7 & 8 of the attached. Through additional engagement with the local GA stakeholder (utilising the Inverness GA Focus Group) substantial changes were made to the CAS design; reducing the overall volume of CAS, incorporating extensive Class E+ conspicuity (Transponder Mandatory Zone (TMZ) at present) airspace with no Class D above 5,500ft and truncating the core CTR at 2,000ft. These changes were designed to enhance 'cooperative' access to the proposed CAS, address the Moray Firth climatic conditions (not infrequent low cloud and haar) and some aspects of the projected SERA VMC requirement changes below 3,000ft.

Note: The CAA is consulting on changes to UK VMC minima requirements in class D airspace. The CAA is proposing that the SERA VMC minima is adopted in the UK in order to fully align with both ICAO and SERA requirements. The change will mean that SERA.5001 will be adopted in full.

The use of extensive Class E+ conspicuity airspace also addressed the RAF Lossiemouth outstanding concerns around access and overlapping ATM procedures. RAF Lossiemouth air traffic controllers will have CAS training and as part of the Inverness transition plan will undertake training on the Inverness simulator.

X believed that both consultations and the environmental assessment remained valid as little change to the ground (local planning) infrastructure had changed. Apart from both unavoidable extant, extended runway centrelines (Inverness town & Nairn) the ground instrument flight procedure ground tracks were above sparsely populated areas. X indicated that the sponsor would be required to undertake a strategic assessment of the infrastructure/geography to provide the necessary evidence to confirm there have been no major changes; that evidence is essential to conclude that the consultation remains relevant at this point.

Under the 2002 Transport Act Section 70, then it is no requirement in Law to consult directly with Parish Councils.

Actions:

1. Z conduct a high-level survey of the area underlying the footprint of the ACP and the associated flight procedures to ensure that the consultation process is still valid and that no new significant ground stakeholders have emerged since the consultation was conducted.

Z

Item 4 – Other Airspace User Requirements (Cloud Flying)

Item 5 - On-going Stakeholder Re-Engagement

Item 7 - Airspace Options / FUA Consideration

LoAs have been agreed in principle between HIAL (Inverness), RAF Lossiemouth (and Tain Range), PDG (commercial survey helicopter operator) and Bristow (SAR). HIAL recognised that a satisfactory resolution had not been reached with the local sailplane operators at Feshiebridge (under CTA-8) and Easterton (to the south, outside the MATZ, of RAF Lossiemouth). Inverness ATC have been working to find an acceptable solution, directly with Feshiebridge, for those pilots with a BGA issued cloud flying rating (CFR) operating out of Feshiebridge, through the BGA's Scotland representative. However, negotiations had 'stalled' specifically in relation to sailplane 'cloud flying' (and the associated EASA pilot's certificate) from Feshiebridge. Several proposals, based on the Flexible Use of Airspace (FUA) principles and parallels with the 'Gussie Box' NATS/Inverness/BGA LoA, had been made within the proffered the LoA; However, the syntax, format and proposals have been rejected. V stated where a sponsor had identified a potentially impacted stakeholder and they considered that the

<p>impact could be part mitigated through the agreement of an LoA, that stakeholder's decision not to engage in dialogue around developing a new LoA is not a reason not to present a proposal to the CAA for adjudication. The CAA would expect the sponsor to make best endeavours, both at the time of proposal development and ongoing, to engage the stakeholder, and to keep the offer of developing an LoA open.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. X will provide V with Feshiebridge responses to the proffered LoA. 3. Y & Z review the format and wording of the draft HIAL/CGC LoA with a view to making it more user friendly and revisit the notice period required from the CGC for de-activation of CTA 8. The CAA would expect any review of the proposed LoA, including the notice period, to be discussed with CGC. 4. Review the safety case to ensure that whatever accommodation may be reached with the CGC regarding access to CTA 8 is reflected in the safety case including any mitigations that need to be put in place to compensate for any additional flexibilities around access to CTA 8. 5. Review the GNSS IAP (Cyrrus) proposals and advise the CAA if any changes are required and provide the CAA with an up to date CAP232 (1732) Aerodrome Survey. 	<p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>Y</p>
<p>Item 6 – CAP725 ACP Timeline and Process</p> <p>The Chair reiterated that the Inverness Controlled Airspace (CAS) Airspace Change Proposal was 'frozen' in Stage 5 (Decision).</p>	
<p>Item 8 – Next Steps/Timeline</p> <p>A asked whether the IFP Regulator had assessed the procedure designs. CAA IFP had not completed the assessment.</p> <p>The Actions designated will be taken and a response provided to the CAA by 30th August 2019.</p> <p>There was no other business.</p>	