

ACOG SC 30th APR 25 – SUMMARY

The ACOG Steering Committee (SC) convened in the De Vere Grand Connaught Rooms in London on Wed 30th April. The SC considered the following subject areas:

- Referring to an action to examine the airspace consultancy market against FASI requirements, Hd of ACOG advised this was on hold while the shape of the UKADS model moving forward was established. The Chair asked whether this was still a threat with UKADS, given the UKADS consultation had indicated that resource may need to be drawn from the consultancy pool; the SC determined this should be identified as a risk, although it was also recognised that the potential changes to CAP1616 could mean a reduction in the requirement for consultants, which would in turn release them for other work.
- Discussion turned to simulation capacity and the recently highlighted requirement for validation sims in addition to development sims for the MTMA. NERL simulator capacity seemed likely to be congested over the relevant period, and the SC felt this had become a programme risk. It was confirmed that the risk already appeared on NERL's RR and it was acknowledged the constraint would militate against running large cluster deployments concurrently. NERL were proactively adjusting the training burden elsewhere and pursuing other options to improve capacity. A discussion around the Part Task Trainer (PTT) identified its use as a potential quick win for reducing the programming and data input load. NERL plan to focus on increasing the use of the PTT. It was reported that given NERL's other modernisation programmes requirements, if all airports in the clusters required the sims at the same time, there would not be the required capacity; ACOG may need to establish priority for the available resource.
- The SC asked what could be done to accelerate the other TMAs to mitigate resource pinch points. ACOG highlighted that the FOA for each ACP was heavy on highly technical noise mapping to be compliant with CAP1616, but the data produced was of limited value during consultations and indeed risked confusing stakeholders; alleviating this requirement, at least in part, could reduce time by up to 3 months, cost, and technical resource, and reduce the overall FOA content submission by around 90%. The Chair observed that if this was applied to all TMAs as a universal process change, it would presumably not reduce the schedule proximities or contention. Hd of ACOG added that the focus on deployment was the MTMA in 2029 and he was not confident this could be applied retrospectively to the ScTMA. ACOG had no control over whether airports passed gateways and the risk of compression would remain.
- ACOG tabled a paper examining the likely costs of any centralised funding for non-LTMA ACP sponsors, within which was a proposal for ACOG to administer the funding. The Chair sought the SC's views on the data presented and whether or not there should be a role for ACOG in administering the fund. The SC asked for clarification as to why ACOG should manage the fund differently to the management of the fund for the LTMA. The Chair observed that the intention is for UKADS to operate a very different model in dealing with LTMA, with different components, authorities and liabilities. Vesting the management of support funding for two dissimilar operating models in the same body seemed like a recipe for confusion and

inefficiency. ACOG managing the non-LTMA support funding may be more coherent. He expressed the opinion that as ACOG would continue to operate through consensus, having some influence on funding support could be a useful management aid. There were also historical issues that arose with external management of the COVID support fund, which negatively impacted ACOG's work. The Chair summarised that the paper would benefit from being amended in tone, and strengthened reasoning for ACOG to manage the fund and bid for the role should be included.

- ACOG reported that GLA had engaged Trax Consultancy to support their ACP, which had derisked their section of the work. EDI had contracted a consultancy from Holland who were inexperienced in the UK CAP1616 process and their wider team was less experienced in ACP management. ACOG had felt obliged to step in and take a more active role to assist EDI in bridging the gaps. ACOG Comms Team were now heavily involved in drafting their consultation documents. The CAA had been helpful in recognising the risk for ACOG with this work and had provided guidance around regulation.
- A set of milestones for pre-FOA had been established for MTMA. The future of DSA was an issue and could potentially create problems for the current MTMA system design. Positive meetings with DfT and CAA had taken place and ACOG had put forward an alternative flexible airspace solution. Endorsement of ACOG's proposal had not yet been received but ACOG were hopeful it would be granted by the Co-Sponsors in May.
- LBA have failed Stage 2 twice. ACOG had stepped in to bridge the gap with resource, and fundamental failings had been identified. ACOG were working with NERL and the regulator to decide on whether to implement the NERL Level 1 ACP with some additional work required on LBA or initiate a new ACP. The CAA had acknowledged the merit in the ACOG-led initiative to fast-track a MAG/LJLA solution and were in discussion to avoid delaying the MTMA. ACOG discussed centralisation of the process, taking the cluster through Stage 3 together. There was work ongoing to centralise the materials including FOA and consultations, to remove duplicated work.
- The SC reviewed a selection of risks from the Horizon Risk Register.