Meeting Notes

CL-0000-FOR-034 V2.3

Project Title/No:	DSA ACP / 5237	Meeting Ref:	CPJ-5237-MIN-235 V1.0
Purpose:	Other Airspace Users Focus Group	Date:	8 May 2019
Venue:	Ambition Meeting Room, Heyford House, Doncaster Sheffield Airport	Time:	1030-1200
Attendees:	[redacted] - ATS Manager, Humberside Airport; [redacted] - Director, Sherburn Aero Club; [redacted] - Manager ATS Doncaster Sheffield Airport, ATCSL; [redacted]) - Head of Operations, DSA Ltd; [redacted] - Airport Operations Manager, DSA Ltd; [redacted] - Principal ATM Consultant, Cyrrus Ltd (Project Lead); [redacted] - FBO Manager, Leeds East Airport; [redacted] - CNS/ATM Support Assistant, Cyrrus Ltd; [redacted] - Airspace Officer, Yorkshire Gliding Club.		
Telephone Attendees	Nil		
Apologies:	[redacted] - Burn Gliding Club Ltd; [redacted] - DAATM; [redacted] - Darlton Gliding Club; [redacted] - British Helicopter Association; [redacted] - The Frank Morgan School of Flying.		
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 a 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 through 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 DSA 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 glider and powered aircraft pilots and local airfield stakeholders, familiar with operations in the vicinity of DSA, 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. Class E (on its own) was referred to by a representative of the General Aviation community in derogatory terms and was not viewed positively. It was opined that only IFR aircraft are afforded separation from each other and many pilots do not appreciate the rules associated with Class E. He cited the scenario of encountering IMC conditions which might induce a pilot to stray into Class E airspace and, as a result, requesting a Deconfliction or Traffic Service from an ATS provider (as one might do in Class G). Upon asking for a radar service under such circumstances, a pilot would then be asked if the aircraft was being flown in accordance with IFR (so that the controller could apply Class E IFR separation). As the answer would at this point would be 'yes', it would result in a 'technical airspace infringement' as it would be apparent that the pilot should have requested clearance to enter under IFR.

1.3.4. It was ventured by a participant that Class E may actually provide a less safe environment than that provided by Class D or Class G owing to the mixed levels of understanding as to the rules associated with a classification of airspace that is rarely experienced in the UK.

1.3.5. There was a discussion about airports in the UK whose ANSPs were not resourced to provide Class D crossing services (albeit it was acknowledged that the recent experience of those present wishing to cross the airspace associated with DSA was positive) and that in some cases a higher level of controlled airspace (together with associated resource) might be more appropriate.

1.3.6. A further discussion revolved around the application of the Standardised European Rules of the Air (SERA) in the UK namely the interpretation by ATCOs of the 'Duty of Care' that ATCOs have in relation to VFR aircraft in Class E airspace. The application of the semi-circular rule was also discussed and how VFR aircraft are routinely not flown at intermediate or 500ft levels.

1.3.7. On the subject of airspace usage, comment was made that the most likely current use by the glider community of the airspace in question was for North-South transits. The Upton Corridor was currently considered to be too congested (perhaps evidenced by the limited number of times annually that it has recently been used as it is may be considered by some not to have the right dimensions). It was suggested that the pressures placed upon this 'glider routing' by the proposed Leeds Bradford Airport ACP airspace expansion may exacerbate this further forcing gliders further east beyond DSA. It was commented that the alternate route (the Trent corridor) was also congested but not to the same extent.

1.4. Follow-Up Action

1.4.1. These notes and the notes associated with the 'ANSPs and Operators Focus Group (held on 1 May 2019) will be distributed along with the Focus Group presentation to all 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 Traffic Environment	Predictable and as a virtue of this workload is lower - Manageable	Normal and manageable	Additional workload requires planning and calling ahead of time, less flexibility to change routing. LoAs can assist local routine operations	Increased workload if needing to alter course vertically or laterally but access should not be difficult to obtain	Should be very good (based on experience at DSA recently)	Good	Normal unless not equipped with a radio or transponder	Very good	Very Good
2	Class E	Unknown traffic environment	Increased as compared to Class D	Increased as compared to Class D	Very good	Very good	Very good	Good	Low/Normal	Significantly lower	Poor
3	Class E RMZ	Better informed environment. Non-transponding aircraft are still 'unknowns' regardless of what is said on entry	Slightly increased (RT) as compared with Class G and D but ability to plan improved	Increased and ACAS cannot be relied upon	Additional workload requires planning and calling ahead of time, less flexibility to change routing. LoAs can assist local routine operations	Very Good	Very good	Good	Slight increase but trade-off is increased flight safety	Better than Class E but not as good as Class D	Better than Class E without RMZ but not as good as Class D

#	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, but some information available via transponder and ACAS is activated	Increased as compared to Class D	Marginally increased (ACAS improves situational awareness)	Very good	Additional workload requires planning and calling ahead of time, less flexibility to change routing. LoAs can assist local routine operations	Very good	Good	Low/Normal	Better than Class E but not as good as Class D	Poor
5	Class E RMZ/TMZ	Known traffic environment but still not fully 'controlled'	Slightly increased as compared with Class D	Normal (perhaps slight increase)	Additional workload requires planning and calling ahead of time, less flexibility to change routing. LoAs can assist local routine operations	Additional workload requires planning and calling ahead of time, less flexibility to change routing. LoAs can assist local routine operations	Very good	Good	Slight increase but trade-off is increased flight safety	Good	Better than Class E without RMZ but not as good as Class D

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.