

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group		
Page 1 of 12	Airspace Change Proposal - Operational Assessment	Version: 1.0/ 2016

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

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 Green not resolved Amber not compliant Red as part of the AR Project Leader's efficient project management.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Page 2 of 12

Airspace Change Proposal - Operational Assessment

Version: 1.0/ 2016

1.	Justification for change and “Option Analysis”	Status
1.1	Is the explanation of the proposed change clear and understood? 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).	YES
1.2	Are the reasons for the change stated and acceptable? 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).	YES
1.3	Have all appropriate alternative options been considered, including the ‘do nothing’ option? 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.	YES
1.4	Is the justification for the selection of the proposed option sound and acceptable? 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.	YES

2.	Airspace Description and Operational Arrangements	Status
2.1	Is the type of proposed airspace clearly stated and understood? 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.	YES
2.2	Are the hours of operation of the airspace and any seasonal variations stated and acceptable?	YES

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Page 3 of 12

Airspace Change Proposal - Operational Assessment

Version: 1.0/ 2016

	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.	
2.3	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?	N/A
	N/A	
2.4	Is the supporting statistical evidence relevant and acceptable?	YES
	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.	
2.5	Is the analysis of the impact of the traffic mix on complexity and workload of operations complete and satisfactory?	YES
	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.	
2.6	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?	YES
	Yes, the LoA outlines the ASM processes to be used to manage the revised EAMTA airspace.	
2.7	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?	N/A
	No such activities to affect.	
2.8	Is the evidence that the Airspace Design is compliant with ICAO SARPs, Airspace Design & FUA regulations, and Eurocontrol Guidance satisfactory?	YES
	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

Page 4 of 12

Airspace Change Proposal - Operational Assessment

Version: 1.0/ 2016

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