# Meeting Notes

CL-0000-FOR-034 V2.3

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project Title/No: | DSA ACP / 5237 | Meeting Ref: | CPJ-5237-MIN-234 V1.0 |
| Purpose: | ANSPs and Operators Focus Group | Date: | 1 May 2019 |
| Venue: | Ambition Meeting Room, Heyford House, Doncaster Sheffield Airport | Time: | 1045-1230 |
| Attendees: | [redacted] – ATM Procedures Prestwick Centre, NATS En-Route Ltd;<br>[redacted] – Operations Director, Cyrrus Ltd;<br>[redacted] – Manager ATS Doncaster Sheffield Airport, ATCSL;<br>[redacted] – Deputy Air Traffic Control Manager, ATCSL;<br>[redacted] – Base Captain, Flybe;<br>[redacted] – Principal ATM Consultant, Cyrrus Ltd (Project Lead);<br>[redacted] – Base Captain, TUI. | | |
| Telephone Attendees | [redacted] - Manager ATC Airspace Design Prestwick Centre, NATS En-Route Ltd; | | |
| Apologies: | [redacted] (ATCSL), [redacted] (NPAS), [redacted] (NATS En-Route Ltd) and [redacted] (2Excel Aviation Ltd) | | |
| Distribution: | All those listed above plus all of those listed above and on the Supplementary Consultation Stakeholder List and [redacted] - CAA Case Officer, SARG | | |

## 1.1. Focus Group Meeting – Background

1.1.1. Following the UK Civil Aviation Authority's (CAA) CAP725 Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) process, Doncaster Sheffield Airport (DSA) submitted a proposal for the introduction of Performance-Based Navigation (PBN) Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs) and Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) in May 2018. The proposal included an additional portion of Controlled Airspace (CAS) in the form of a Control Area (CTA). This airspace had been proposed as a volume of Class D airspace to be known as 'CTA-13' and was designed to contain the ROGAG SIDs to align with existing CAA Policy.

1.1.2. In March 2019, the CAA Safety and Airspace Regulation (SARG) department directed DSAL to conduct supplementary consultation with aviation stakeholders on the classification of CTA-13 prior to re-submitting the DSA ACP.

1.1.3. An essential part of the consultation process is the use of Focus Groups to inform aviation stakeholders providing them with sufficient knowledge to contribute to the discussion which would flow into the consultation. This supplementary consultation, purely focusing on the classification of CTA-13, will run for a period of four weeks from 10 May 2019 until 7 Jun 2019.

1.1.4. Cyrrus has been employed by DSAL to assist in the delivery of this ACP. Cyrrus is an aviation consultancy company with extensive experience in assisting Sponsors deliver their ACPs.

## 1.2. Conduct of the Focus Group

1.2.1. Cyrrus welcomed everyone in attendance and thanked them for their participation. All participants were briefed using the MS PowerPoint presentation (CPJ-5237-PRE-231).

1.2.2. Once the background to the supplementary consultation had been presented, Cyrrus facilitated a discussion on the various airspace classification options available for CTA-13. The views of both airline pilots and air traffic controllers, familiar with DSA operations, were captured in the matrix at Table 1. The matrix was used to identify the relative impact of the different airspace options on various aviation stakeholders.

## 1.3. Focus Group Output

1.3.1. The Focus Group session was aimed at:

- Establishing a common understanding of the classifications and the potential impacts of each on different users; and
- Facilitating a discussion that would enable stakeholders to make an informed decision.

1.3.2. The matrix captures the key points of the discussion and summarises the views of those involved in this Focus Group. No conclusion was reached on the airspace classification as this was not the intention of the session.

1.3.3. It was clear that the introduction of Class E airspace without an associated TMZ, RMZ or a combination of the two, was an unsatisfactory solution to this community of stakeholders. Class E (on its own) was considered to provide a less safe environment than that provided by Class D and, owing to the 'false sense of security' engendered in IFR pilots by the definition of Class E as CAS, there was the potential that Class E (without an associated RMZ/TMZ) could be a less safe environment than Class G if IFR pilots believed they were being afforded the protection associated with CAS.

1.3.4. These notes and the notes associated with the 'Other Airspace Users' Focus Group (to be held on 8 May 2019) will be distributed along with the Focus Group presentation to all the identified aviation stakeholders to inform the four-week supplementary consultation.

| # | Option | Traffic Environment | Controller Workload | CAT Pilot Workload | Access for Non-RT (VFR) | Access for Non-Transponder (VFR | Access for equipped airspace user (VFR) | Access for equipped airspace user (IFR) | Transit traffic pilot workload (VFR) | Perceived Protection for ATC, CAT and IFR aircraft | Predictability of flight profiles |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Class D | Known Environment | Manageable, steady | Lower as compared with Class G or E | Additional planning required, less flexible in the case of diversion from planned route | Reasonably simple, potentially slightly inconvenienced, minor delays or change of routing/level possible | Relatively simple, potentially slightly inconvenienced, minor delays or change of routing/level possible | Relatively simple, potentially slightly inconvenienced, minor delays or change of routing/level possible | Manageable | Very Good | Very Good |
| 2 | Class E | Unknown Traffic Environment (Non-Squawkers or NMC have to be assumed to be inside airspace vertically if inside laterally) | Increased as compared to Class D | Very High, ACAS cannot be relied upon therefore good lookout required at all times | Very Good | Very Good | Very Good | Very Good | Normal | Aircrew lulled into false sense of security as airspace defined as CAS but in reality, there is little protection (ATCOs may not be aware of all VFR aircraft and do not need to separate IFR from VFR albeit the 'Duty of Care' clause) | Unpredictable VFR aircraft |
| 3 | Class E RMZ | Better informed – if lose Primary Radar, at least aircraft are still calling prior to entry | Lower workload than Class E but on a par with Class D. RT workload is greater than Class G but same as Class D | High, ACAS can't be relied upon therefore good lookout required at all times | Additional planning required, less flexible in the case of diversion from planned route | Reasonably easy | Reasonably easy | Relatively simple, potentially slightly inconvenienced, minor delays or change of routing/level possible | Normal | Better than Class E without RMZ or TMZ but less protection than afforded by Class D | Improvement on Class E without RMZ or TMZ |

| # | Option | Traffic Environment | Controller Workload | CAT Pilot Workload | Access for Non-RT (VFR) | Access for Non-Transponder (VFR | Access for equipped airspace user (VFR) | Access for equipped airspace user (IFR) | Transit traffic pilot workload (VFR) | Perceived Protection for ATC, CAT and IFR aircraft | Predictability of flight profiles |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Class E TMZ | Unknown Traffic Environment (note that Mode C of VFR crossers is not verified and so cannot be used for separation) | Increased (as compared with Class D) but broad utilisation of listening-out squawk may assist | Relatively high, greater confidence in ACAS | Good | Additional planning required, less flexible in the case of diversion from planned route | Very Good | Very Good | Normal | Improvement on Class E without RMZ or TMZ but worse than Class D. CAT pilot gets benefit of ACAS but less preferable to ATC as no intentions known (no RT required) | Unpredictable VFR aircraft |
| 5 | Class E RMZ/TMZ | Known Traffic Environment but VFR aircraft are still 'uncontrollable' | Closer to Class D workload than Class E but still slightly increased | Slightly increased from Class D | Additional planning, less flexible in the case of diversion from planned route | Additional planning, less flexible in the case of diversion from planned route | Very Good | Very Good | Normal | Good, acceptable | Improvement on Options 2, 3 and 4 |

**Table 1: Airspace Classification Impacts Matrix**

Note: The comments above are highly dependent upon the level and nature of the activity taking place in the airspace and this matrix contains generic statements that do not consider activity levels.