Post Implementation Review

Procedures

ATS-PROC-0152

Version 0.4

Effective 20 December 2024

Endorsed:	Network Operations
	Head of Network Planning
Approved:	Community Engagement
	Head of Community Engagement

Change summary

Version	Date	Change description
0.4	20 December 2024	Final

This document was created using Generic Document Template C-TEMP0047 Version 11.

Table of contents

1   Purpose

This Procedure details the cross-functional requirements for the delivery of Post Implementation Reviews (PIRs) of airspace and flight path changes implemented by Airservices Australia. It also details the requirements for delivery of the recommendations and actions that result from these reviews.

This Procedure is designed to:

- clearly articulate the roles and responsibilities of the various functional areas in delivering PIRs and the recommendations and actions resulting
- define the investigation and decision-making processes
- articulate the responsibilities of decision-makers and relevant considerations
- provide a process for considering feedback as part of the decision-making process where community views on change proposals are evenly split
- provide templates to support investigations and decision-making.

2   Post Implementation Reviews (PIRs)

Airservices conducts PIRs of flight path and airspace changes a minimum of 12 months after the change, unless agreed by the Airspace Governance Panel (AGP). The purpose is to compare the actual operations to those expected prior to the change implementation to ensure it is meeting the intent of the original scope.

In accordance with [Environmental Management of Changes to Aircraft Operations National Operating Standard](#) Section 8, the PIR will:

a) verify assumptions made about potential environmental and community impacts and risks, and the effectiveness of the change implementation;

b) compare forecast operations with actual operations to determine any material difference and identify possible mitigations where required;

c) provide updated information to the community based on the findings of a & b above

d) inform future changes and improve the overall change management process;

e) update ongoing operational environmental and reputational risks, as required.

The PIR will also seek to verify assumptions made about air traffic control and industry impacts and consider appropriate safety or efficiency improvements.

The change is required to operate for a minimum of 12 months prior to undertaking the PIR to allow a full year of operational data to be captured, to take into account seasonal variations.

Funding for this level of PIR will come out of operational budgets across the business units involved.

3   In scope

This Procedure applies to all airspace and flight path changes involving implementation of a Community Engagement Plan (CEP).

The PIR process is a separate, but related process to the *Changes to Airspace and Aircraft Operations* Procedure (ATS-PROC-0147), with common governance, assessment and engagement structures. Changes made as a result of PIRs will be subject to PROC-0147 requirements for implementation of the change.

This procedure details the process to be followed to conduct a PIR and to implement the recommendations of a PIR.

4 Out of scope

The PIR process does not apply to:

a) airspace or flight path changes not subject to the requirements of the CES, including temporary changes, runway works and other excluded activities

b) changes to Tower/approach service hours as described in ATS-PROC 0147

c) changes made by third parties, i.e, Procedure Design companies or airport operators.

Safety PIRs are conducted separate to this procedure. A safety PIR reviews the safety aspects of a change as detailed in a Safety Assessment Report or Safety Case. The Safety PIR must be conducted in accordance with the timeline specified in the Safety Assessment Report or Safety Case and no later than twelve months after change deployment.

Feedback from community and industry received during the PIR that does not relate to the operations or the intent of the original scope of change being reviewed, will not be included in the PIR findings and recommendations. These suggestions will be progressed through a separate change investigation process (see Section 11).

5 Administration

This Procedure is administered by Airspace and Flight Path Design but will be delivered by the appointed PIR Manager. PIRs are recorded in the Airspace Change Program Jira project by the Airspace Design (ASD) Coordinator.

6 Roles and responsibilities

6.1 Airspace Governance Panel

The Airspace Governance Panel (AGP) is responsible for the governance of PIRs. AGP membership is detailed at 4.1.1 in ATS-PROC-0147.

6.1.1 AGP PIR Responsibilities

For PIRs and PIR recommendations the AGP is responsible for:

a) agreeing the level of PIR required based on the original CES change level

b) assigning the priority of the PIR against other Airspace Change Program priorities

c) appointing the accountable project manager for PIR delivery

d) accepting the environmental change screening (ECS) for any recommended flight path or airspace change recommendations

e) assigning the priority of PIR recommendation investigation against other Airspace Change Program priorities

f) appointing the accountable CANO/CAO manager for recommendation delivery (some process related recommendations – non airspace and flight path changes - may be assigned to a manager from another area of Airservices, for example Environment Assessments or Community Engagement).

Note: Preliminary noticeability and sensitivity assessment (PNSA) and Community Sensitivity Analysis (CSA) are not required for the delivery of PIR recommendations and actions, as communities subject to PIRs are already known to Airservices.

6.2 Joint Implementation Group

The Joint Implementation Group (JIG) plays a crucial role in validating decisions made at each critical stage of the PIR and PIR recommendation delivery. JIG membership is detailed at 4.2.1 of the ATS-PROC-0147.

6.2.1 JIG PIR Responsibilities

For a PIR or PIR recommendations the JIG is responsible for:

a) endorsing PIR findings, recommendations and actions ahead of reporting to the community and industry

b) endorsing PIR recommendation design options and preferred designs for community and industry engagement

c) accepting the final PIR recommendation investigation outcome and endorsing to progress to the delegated decision-maker for a decision.

6.3 Project team

A PIR project team will be established to facilitate the delivery of a PIR and of its recommendations. Ideally the same personnel involved in delivery of the initial change project will form the PIR project team and PIR recommendations project team, to ensure continuity of knowledge and continuous learning and improvement. Where deemed necessary, additional SMEs, including consultants, can be requested to conduct further validation and verification of PIR findings.

The project team will consist of a range of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to ensure full and proper assessment, evaluation and consideration of the new operations and opportunities for improvement. This should include the following roles as a minimum:

- PIR Manager
- Safety SME
- Operations SME (local ATC)
- Flight Path Designer and/or Instrument Flight Procedures Designer
- Environmental Assessment Specialist
- Customer Engagement lead
- Community Engagement lead

- Government Relations lead.

Additional roles may be required, depending on the size of the PIR, for example a Coordinator or Scheduler etc. The need for any additional roles will be determined by the Accountable Project Manager.

The table below describes the roles and accountability of each of these SMEs during a PIR and in delivery of PIR recommendations.

Role	PIR	PIR Recommendations
PIR Manager *(May be the AGP appointed accountable manager, the original change Project Manager, or Lead Designer for other airspace and flight path changes where not delivered as a formal project)*	• Oversee PIR delivery. • Prioritisation of PIR activity in consultation with the AFPDM and AGP. • Formation of PIR project team. • Briefing of AGP on PIR progress and findings • Establishment and oversight of adherence to PIR timeline, including publicly committed timeframes. • Maintain records of all PIR assessment reporting including safety, operational and environmental assessments, as well as project team and JIG meeting minutes (the Airspace Design Coordinator will assist the PIR Manager in records maintenance using required internal systems). • Review and endorsement of engagement material content.	• Oversee delivery of PIR recommendations. • Seek AGP acceptance of CIRRIS environmental change screenings (ECS) for options developed in response to PIR recommendations. • Prioritisation of PIR recommendation delivery in consultation with the AFPDM and AGP. • Establishment and oversight of adherence to PIR recommendations delivery timeline, including publicly committed timeframes. • Formation of PIR recommendations project team. • Briefing JIG on PIR recommendations progress and seeking endorsement of proposed actions/changes resulting from it. • Maintain records of all PIR recommendation assessments including safety, operational and environmental assessments, as well as project team and JIG meeting minutes. • Review and endorsement of engagement material content.
Safety SME	• Complete the Safety PIR in accordance with [Operational Safety Change Management Process](#) involving operations, flight path design and industry SMEs to identify realised risks or safety issues. • (Safety reviews are usually within 3 months and no later than 12 months after the change.) • Input to PIR recommendations development, ensuring recommendations give due regard to safety. • Review and endorsement of engagement material content.	• Provide input to initial options developed in response to PIR recommendations • Assess impact, complexity and risk of options developed in response to PIR recommendations in accordance with [AA-PROC-SAF-0104](#). • Document these safety assessments so they can be referred to in developing community-facing information. • Review and endorsement of engagement material content. •

Role	PIR	PIR Recommendations
Operations SME	• Provide advice on operations and opportunities for improvement across operational, customer and community interests. • Provide input to and advice on the feasibility of PIR recommendations as they are developed. • Review and endorsement of engagement material content.	• Provide input to options developed in response to PIR recommendations. This should include consideration of feasibility, potential conflicting operations, and viable alternatives. • Identify inputs required from other operational SMEs to progress each recommendation. • Review and endorsement of engagement material content.
Flight Path Designer/ Instrument Flight Procedures Designer	• Identify potential recommendations to address actual operations that are not consistent with forecast operations, or to address community and customer feedback on those operations. • Work with the operations and safety SMEs to ensure recommendations are safe and feasible. • Develop schematic designs demonstrating the intent of the PIR recommendation to support community understanding. • Review and endorsement of engagement material content.	• Develop design options in response to PIR recommendations. Where feasible, multiple options should be developed for engagement with community and customers. • Support effective community engagement by explaining the designs and methodologies, and how the Flight Path Design Principles were considered in the process. • Develop updated designs in response to customer and community feedback on the options, in consultation with operational and safety SMEs. • Review and endorsement of engagement material content.
Environmental Assessment Specialist	• Compare forecast operations with actual operations to determine any material difference, reasons for this and identify possible mitigations where required. • Provide input to recommendations development in relation to potential noise or operations changes. • Update any assumptions used in modelling to improve accuracy of forecasts in future. • Review and endorsement of engagement material content.	• Review initial options to identify as a minimum their impact on noise, altitude, frequency of overflight and CO_2 emissions. • Complete environmental assessments on preferred options for changes that screen in per Environmental Management of Changes to Aircraft Operations National Operating Standard Section 6.1.2. • Where necessary, refer changes that trigger EPBC Act criteria in accordance with Environmental Management of Changes to Aircraft Operations National Operating Standard section 6.4.2. • Ensure all NOS 2.100 requirements are considered in environmental assessment of preferred options. • Review and endorsement of engagement material content.

Role	PIR	PIR Recommendations
Customer Engagement lead	• Industry engagement planning (considering an aligned approach with community engagement where possible) • Gather feedback from customers on actual operations. • Input to PIR recommendations development, including engaging with customers as required, to ensure industry perspectives are considered.	• Participate in options development discussions. • Gather feedback from customers on options developed in response to PIR recommendations. • Engage with industry on requirements to validate options including simulations or other actions.
Government Relations lead	• Input to PIR recommendations development, including engaging with Australian Government as required, to ensure Australian Government is informed on potential PIR outcomes.	• Review recommendations to enable information to be shared with Government stakeholders as appropriate.
Community Engagement lead	• Identify key themes from community complaints to the Noise Complaints and Information Service (NCIS) and to Community Engagement for consideration in the PIR. • Engage the community on relevant aspects of the PIR, in accordance with this procedure, including Terms of Reference, actual vs forecast operations findings and draft PIR recommendations. • Development of engagement materials, ensuring all information, including reporting, is clear and easily interpreted. • Monitor community feedback throughout the PIR. • Input to PIR recommendations to ensure community views are represented.	• Participate in options development discussions. • Develop engagement materials explaining options developed in response to PIR recommendations and their potential impact/benefit. • Gather feedback from the community on these options. • Deliver engagement on PIR recommendations in accordance with the Community Engagement Standard (AA-NOS-CMYE-0001).

6.4   Decision-makers

The accountable decision-maker is the Senior Manager (Head) or Executive (Chief) within Airservices as defined in the ATS Delegated Authorities procedure (ATS-PROC-0037) (delegation procedure) to accept the change.

Decision-makers will be required at two key milestones in the end-to-end PIR process:

1. Final PIR Report recommendations – acceptance of the report and its recommendations at the completion of the PIR

2. Implementation of changes resulting from investigation and engagement on PIR recommendations – acceptance of airspace and flight path changes, and changes to non-flight path related matters (i.e. changes to EIA process or community engagement methods) as appropriate.

In both cases, recommendations will be reviewed and a decision made by either a Head or Chief of the area of the business that is responsible for delivery of the service being changed, per the delegation policy. For example:

- Change to airspace operations – Airspace Network
- Change to airfield operations – Aerodromes
- Change to environmental assessment methods or measures – Environmental Assessment
- Change to community engagement practice – Community Engagement.

In keeping with Airservices's delegation policy, accountable decision-makers are determined by the level of risk identified in relation to the proposal. This level of risk is determined by:

- Flight path and airspace changes – Environmental Assessment
- Sensitive locations – AGP register of sensitive locations (reviewed six monthly).

The accountable decision-makers based on level of risk are:

- High-risk changes – Chief
- Low to medium-risk changes – Head.

The JIG endorse the recommendations. The PIR Manager will present the recommendations to the delegated decision-maker through a memo, summarising the recommendations and the substantiating reasons for it, with a more detailed report attached.

Decision-makers should be given a minimum of two weeks to consider the change recommendation and to seek further advice as necessary.

All memos will be signed by the appropriate decision-maker. Where a change recommendation is rejected, the decision-maker is to provide substantiating reasons for this that can be published (see Section 9.3).

7   End-to-end PIR Process

The end-to-end PIR process contains two sequential stages:

1. Post Implementation Review – to establish findings and recommendations
2. PIR recommendation implementation – to deliver the recommended actions from the PIR.

The specific focus of each of these stages is defined below.

1. **Post Implementation Review** of an airspace or flight path change – this stage will conclude with a PIR report containing the findings of the PIR and recommendations and/or actions to be delivered in response.

Key focus:

- Review and compare forecast aircraft operations and noise levels in Airservices' earlier Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) against actual aircraft movement data and noise levels post-implementation and provide updated information to the community.
- Review the application of Noise Abatement Procedures (NAPs) implemented as part of the change to reduce the impact of aircraft operations on the community.

- Identify opportunities to minimise the impact of aircraft operations on the community and consider these against Airservices' *Flight Path Design Principles*.

- Engage genuinely with the community to provide opportunities to influence the outcomes of the PIR in accordance with Airservices' *Community Engagement Standard for flight path and airspace changes* (CES).

- Engage genuinely with industry – airports, airlines, general aviation operators and industry associations – on operational experience of the new flight paths and consider opportunities for improvements against Airservices Flight Path Design Principles.

- Engage in detail with Airservices Air Traffic Control and others as relevant (eg. Defence) to gain operational knowledge and inputs to recommendation development to ensure these are feasible to implement.

- Take learnings from the change implementation and PIR outcomes to apply to future airspace and flight path changes, our procedures and practice.

2. **PIR Recommendations Implementation** – this stage involves investigating the recommendations and/or actions resulting from the PIR, to identify feasible options and final changes to be implemented to improve operations and/or reduce impacts.

Key focus:

- Develop options that respond to PIR recommendations, specifically addressing the issues identified in the PIR.

- Present options to the community and industry to seek feedback on their support or otherwise, and opportunities to further enhance the design/outcome.

- Present preferred changes to the community and industry, including Environmental Assessment, for further feedback and input.

- Clearly and transparently share assessment details for all initial options and preferred options, including any constraints to their use, noise information, frequency of use and other data of relevance to understanding the potential impact, positive and negative, of the option.

- Transparently report on decisions made in relation to implementation of changes based on the PIR recommendations and options engagement, including the basis on which decisions have been made, factors considered and any weighting applied to these factors. This should include any suggested improvements investigated but found not to be feasible to progress, the reasons for this and any related options considered to resolve the issue.

- Document all considerations, in particular safety assessments, environmental assessments, and customer and community engagement assessments.

- Where applicable, present decision-making outcomes against the Flight Path Design Principles to clearly demonstrate how the various, often competing, factors have been considered.

Section 8 below provides the step-by-step process, documentation requirements and decision-making considerations for delivery of a PIR.

Section 9 below provides the step-by-step process, documentation requirements and decision-making considerations for implementation of PIR recommendations.

8 Post Implementation Reviews (PIRs)

The following summarises the requirements of each step of the PIRs based on the level of change originally made, as defined in the [Community Engagement Standard (AA-NOS-CMYE-0001)](#) (CES):

- Level 1 – new flight paths/airspace to support airport expansion

- Level 2 – new or changed flight paths in an existing airspace

- Level 3 - smaller operational changes in existing airspace.

Refer to [AA-NOS-CMYE-0001](#) for a detailed description of the levels of change.

Note, a higher level of PIR may be selected where deemed necessary to address community needs.

8.1 Process for PIRs

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Step 1 – PIR planning		
- Develop PIR Project Plan* - Establish PIR project team - Develop draft Terms of Reference** - Develop Community Engagement Plan*** - Develop Industry Engagement Plan - Develop Government Engagement Plan	- Develop PIR Project Plan - Establish PIR project team - Develop draft Terms of Reference - Develop Community Engagement Plan - Develop Industry Engagement Plan - Develop Government Engagement Plan	- Develop PIR Project Plan, including detailed scope - Establish PIR project team - Develop Community Engagement Plan, where required - Develop Industry Engagement Plan, where required - Develop Government Engagement Plan
Step 2 – PIR initiation		
- Release draft Terms of Reference for comment – 4 weeks - Establish engagement channels - Review complaint data, engagement team feedback and industry feedback - Review actual vs forecast operations^ - Seek ATC feedback into actual operations	- Release draft Terms of Reference for comment – 4 weeks - Establish engagement channels - Review complaint data, engagement team feedback and industry feedback - Review actual vs forecast operations^ - Seek ATC feedback into actual operations	- Review complaint data, engagement team feedback and industry feedback - Review actual vs forecast operations^ - Seek ATC feedback into actual operations
Step 3 – PIR findings development		

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
• Release final Terms of Reference (if significant changes, a further 4 week review period should be considered prior to proceeding with PIR activity) • Conduct any further analysis required by the final TOR that was not included in Step 2 • Release actual vs forecast comparison information • Community and industry engagement on actual vs forecast operations findings and other matters of interest – 4 to 6 weeks • Draft PIR report development# • JIG endorsement of Final PIR report and its recommendations for engagement	• Release final Terms of Reference (if significant changes, a further 4 week review period should be considered prior to proceeding with PIR activity) • Conduct any further analysis required by the final TOR that was not included in Step 2 • Release actual vs forecast comparison information • Community and industry engagement on actual vs forecast operations findings and other matters of interest – 4 weeks • Draft PIR report development# • JIG endorsement of Final PIR report and its recommendations for engagement	• Draft PIR report development
Step 4 – Draft PIR report		
• Release draft PIR report for community and customer feedback – 6 week review period • Community and industry engagement on draft PIR report findings and suggested recommendations – 4 to 6 weeks • Final PIR Report development## • JIG endorsement of Final PIR report and its recommendations	• Release draft PIR report for community and customer feedback – 4 week review period • Community and industry engagement on draft PIR report findings and suggested recommendations – 4 weeks • Final PIR Report development## • JIG endorsement of Final PIR report and its recommendations	• Release draft PIR report, including recommendations for community and industry feedback where relevant – 4 week review period • Consider feedback received where appropriate • Final PIR Report development
Step 5 – Final PIR report		
• Approval of Final PIR Report by decision-maker (if significant changes, a further 4 week review period should be considered prior to proceeding with PIR activity) • Release Final PIR Report	• Approval of Final PIR Report by decision-maker (if significant changes, a further 4 week review period should be considered prior to proceeding with PIR activity) • Release Final PIR Report	• Approval of Final PIR Report by decision-maker • Release Final PIR Report

8.2 Documentation for PIRs

The following have specific requirements:

* Project Plan

The Project Plan will document as a minimum:

- Change description
- Location and level of sensitivity
- Level of change
- PIR project team members
- Scope of PIR
- Program for delivery
- Identified decision-maker.

** Terms of Reference (TOR)

The TOR will be developed using the Terms of Reference template and will identify:

- Change description
- Brief history of the change
- Level of change
- Scope of PIR
- Specific areas of focus if already identified
- Communities and other external stakeholders to be engaged.

The Terms of Reference will be developed with the involvement of the PIR Project Team. The process for compiling this will be determined by the PIR Manager, but should involve a group workshop or similar to work through the appropriate scope of the review based on the specifics of the change implemented.

*** Community Engagement Plan (CEP)

The CEP will be developed using the Community Engagement Plan template and will identify:

- Change description
- TOR scope
- Known community issues and feedback to date
- Engagement to be conducted in each step of the PIR
- Engagement tools to be used
- Communities and stakeholders to be engaged
- Engagement program.

The CEP will reflect the principles and consider use of the engagement tools outlined in the CES. Specific timeframes for engagement are noted in the CES for each level of change.

^Actual vs Forecast Operations Assessment

Operational assessment

Review scheduled operations and compliance with published approach and departure procedure designs, including:

a) Flight path track compliance and consistency with expected operations

b) Review of ATC traffic management (including application of any Noise Abatement Procedures)

Consideration of the opportunities identified by ATC and industry to enhance the operational efficiency and performance of flight paths, air traffic management procedures and overall network efficiency.

Environmental assessment

Verify assumptions made about potential environmental and community impacts which were released as part of the final flight path/airspace design.

Consider the following noise metrics:

a) N60 and N70 noise contours

b) Lamax (maximum single event noise levels) for specific, representative aircraft types (as applied in the EIA)

c) A comparison of modelled noise levels against measured noise levels where noise complaints have been received post-implementation

Comparison of forecast aircraft movement numbers against actual.

#Draft PIR report

The draft PIR report will be prepared using the PIR Report template and will document the scope of the PIR, the findings of comparative work, feedback received from community and industry, the key issues to be addressed through PIR recommendations and the proposed recommendations in response. It will also include a response to any issues raised or recommended changes put forward that cannot be progressed due to not being feasible, including the specific reasons for this, so these can be closed out.

The Draft PIR Report and its recommendations will be prepared with the involvement of the PIR Project Team. The process for compiling this will be determined by the PIR Manager but should involve a group workshop or similar to work through the findings, issues and possible solutions/actions to address. Additional work to develop recommendations may be required outside of this meeting.

The Draft PIR Report will be refined for community and industry review by the Community Engagement Lead with input from the Project Team.

Final PIR Report

The Final PIR Report will be prepared using the draft PIR report structure and will not contain any recommendations that, based on the available level of assessment at the time, could not be progressed if found to be safe and feasible. This is to avoid raising community expectations of something that will not be delivered. It is also to support a positive assessment approach to all PIR recommendations – the intent to implement improvements rather than find reasons to avoid changes.

The Final PIR Report will be prepared with the involvement of the PIR Project Team. The process for compiling this will be determined by the PIR Manager, but should involve a group workshop or similar to agree the final PIR findings.

The FINAL PIR Report will be provided to the decision-maker with an accompanying decision-maker's briefing memo.

PIR Recommendations Decision Memo

The PIR Recommendations Decision Memo will be prepared using the PIR Recommendations Decision Memo template and will provide the decision-maker with a clearly defined decision request, including a summary of the original change, the PIR process and the recommendations subject to the decision. It will address each of the decision-maker's considerations outlined in Section 8.3 with links to supporting evidence should the decision-maker require further details.

8.3 Decision for PIRs

PIR decision-makers' considerations

Decision-makers during a PIR will be required to approve the final recommendations of the PIR. In making this decision, they will give regard to:
- ☐ Is the recommendation/s feasible and able to be adopted by the business if the subsequent investigation finds in its favour?
- ☐ Is the recommendation/s clearly worded and directly relevant to the issue it is attempting to address?
- ☐ Is the recommendation/s supported by appropriate documentation?
- ☐ Is the recommendation/s reasonable given the level of community and industry interest in the outcome and the investment required to deliver it?

9 PIR Recommendations Implementation

All recommendations of a final PIR report are to be investigated. These will often cover a range of different areas including, but not limited to:

- Airspace and Flight Path changes
- Noise Abatement Procedures
- Operational changes (ATC)
- Noise and operational reporting
- Changes to practices and procedures.

9.1 Process for PIR recommendations implementation

Flight Path and Airspace Changes	Non-Flight Path and Airspace Changes
Step 1 - PIR recommendation delivery planning	
- Submit PIR recommendations to AGP for sizing and prioritisation - Develop PIR Recommendation Delivery Project Plan - Establish PIR recommendation project team - Develop Community Engagement Plan^ - Develop Industry Engagement Plan	
Step 2 – PIR recommendation options development	
- Develop flight path change options / NAP options - Safety and operational assessment to confirm if feasible (in consultation with industry where their expertise is required) - Develop flight path change / NAP assessment criteria - High level environmental impact review – noise level, altitude, frequency of overflight, CO2 emissions etc - JIG endorsement to proceed with options to engagement	- Develop option/s to address non-flight path change related recommendations - Consult with relevant internal business areas responsible for management/ oversight of these matters as required - JIG endorsement to proceed with options to engagement
Step 3 – PIR recommendation options engagement	
- Options presented to community and industry for feedback in accordance with CEP – 4 to 6 weeks - Feedback captured and Options Assessment Report* prepared noting which options will proceed to preferred stage for further development, and providing a rationale for these decisions - JIG endorsement of the outcome may be necessary for high risk changes - Release Options Assessment Report for community and industry review and feedback – 4 to 6 weeks	- Option/s presented to community and industry for feedback in accordance with CEP – 4 to 6 weeks - Feedback captured and Options Assessment Report prepared noting which options will proceed to further development, and providing a rationale for these decisions - Release Options Assessment Report for community and industry feedback – 4 to 6 weeks (note: this could be part of a flight path and airspace change Options Assessment Report if completed)
Step 4 – PIR recommendation preferred option development	

Flight Path and Airspace Changes	**Non-Flight Path and Airspace Changes**
- Preferred option designed to greater level of detail (NAPs expanded to include exemptions to use) - Safety and operational assessment (including industry assessment where required) to confirm no safety risks or that identified risks can be mitigated - Environmental Impact Assessment completed in accordance with NOS-2.100 Section 6.4.	Process and inputs required to progress change identified and programmed.
Step 5 – PIR recommendation preferred option engagement	
- Preferred design / NAP detail presented to community and industry for feedback in accordance with CEP – 4 to 6 weeks - Feedback captured and community engagement summary prepared for inclusion in final assessment report (a stand alone community engagement report may also be required to support Change Request Centre submission of flight path and procedure changes) - Final Assessment Report** completed against <u>Flight Path Design Principles</u>***, including a final recommendation - JIG endorses Final Assessment Report and decision memo to decision-maker	- Proposed changes, actions required and timeline presented to community and industry for feedback in accordance with the CEP – 4 to 6 weeks - Feedback captured and summary report prepared for inclusion in Final PIR Report - Final review completed and memo prepared, including final recommendation to the decision-maker - JIG endorses Final Assessment Report and decision memo to go to decision-maker
Step 6 – Final Decision	
- Decision-maker reviews Final Assessment Report and determines if the change is approved to proceed; if further work is required, or if it is not approved. - Where a recommended change is not approved by the decision-maker, the reasons for this and evidence relied on will be documented in a Change Decision template#	- Decision-maker reviews memo and determines if the change is approved to proceed; if further work is required, or if it is not approved. - Where a recommended change is not approved by the decision-maker, the reasons for this and evidence relied on will be documented in a Change Decision template#

9.2 Documentation for PIR recommendations implementation

The following have specific requirements:

^ Community Engagement Plan (CEP)

The CEP will be developed using the Community Engagement Plan template and will identify:

- Change history
- PIR recommendation being addressed
- Issues this recommendation is addressing
- Engagement to be conducted in each step
- Engagement tools to be used

- Communities and stakeholders to be engaged
- Engagement program.

The CEP will reflect the principles and consider use of the engagement tools outlined in the CES. Specific timeframes for engagement are noted in this document for each level of change.

* Options Assessment Report

The Options Assessment Report will be prepared using the Options Assessment Report and will provide comparison of all options against the existing operation, with the intent of identifying the best holistic outcome. Specific measures to include are population overflown, population exposed to 60 and 70 decibel noise levels, assessment of newly overflown populations and track mile/CO2 emissions. It should also include any criteria relevant to the specific recommendation – i.e. more over water operations; more equitably sharing aircraft operations etc.

Assessment criteria will be developed in advance of options release and shared with the community and industry at the time these options are engaged on, in the interest of assessment transparency.

The Options Assessment Report will be prepared with the involvement of the Project Team. The process for compiling this will be determined by the PIR Manager, but should involve a group workshop or similar to work through options. Additional work to define the options merit may be required outside of this meeting.

The Options Assessment Report will be refined for community and industry review by the Community Engagement SME with input from the Project Team.

** Final Assessment Report

The Final Assessment Report will be prepared using the Final Assessment Report template and will document the key considerations and information relied on in forming the recommendation to the decision-maker. It will as a minimum assess the changes against the [Flight Path Design Principles](#) to identify the trade-offs required by the change. It will also document community and industry sentiment and how this has influenced the decision.

All assessments will give regard to the intent of the recommendation, and whether or not the preferred design / NAP fulfils its intentions. Where it does, barring any operational safety issues that cannot be mitigated and previously unexpected trade-off consequences, the change should be recommended to proceed.

The Final Assessment Report will follow the same development and refinement process as the Options Assessment Report noted above.

*** Flight Path Design Principles application

Airservices' [Flight Path Design Principles](#) will be applied in assessing the PIR recommended change proposal. These Principles aim to strike a balance by identifying and recording the consideration, benefits and disbenefits of the proposal against a range of competing criteria. This assessment will be included as a key focus in the Final Assessment Report.

Change Decision Memo

The Change Decision Memo will be prepared using the Change Decision Memo template and will provide the decision-maker with a clearly defined decision request, including a summary of the original change, the PIR recommendations and

investigation process, and the outcomes relied upon in making the recommendation. It will address each of the decision-maker's considerations outlined in Section 9.3 with links to supporting evidence should the decision-maker require further details.

9.3 Decision for PIR recommended change implementation

PIR recommended change decision-makers' considerations

Decision-makers during delivery of PIR recommendations and/or actions will be required to make a decision to approve or reject the proposed change. This will include a recommendation from the project team/JIG based on assessment of the proposed change, its benefits, impacts and other relevant matters. In making their decision, the decision-maker will give regard to:

- Has the proposed change been adequately assessed and are all operational factors taken into account in the recommendation:
  - o Is the proposed change safe?
  - o Is the proposed change compliant with legislation, Standards, rulesets and other relevant guidance?
  - o Will the change add complexity to our or industry's operations?
  - o Are these complexities able to be mitigated with appropriate measures?
- Have all aspects of the change been assessed – design, implementation, operation, exemptions?
- Have all assessments been adequately documented?
- Does the proposed change provide a net benefit to the community, industry or operations?
- What success measures have been identified so we can appropriately monitor and assess the change and confirm if it has delivered on its promise?
- What exemptions might apply to its use or application?
- Has community and industry engagement been completed in keeping with this procedure?

Where the decision-maker identifies a flaw or insufficient assessment in the final decision recommendation, the report and is recommendation may be reviewed and resubmitted for a fresh decision.

Where the assessment is not questioned, but where the decision-maker rejects the recommendation, reasons are to be provided for that decision. This will be evidence-based, supported by relevant assessment or other information to clearly articulate the reason for this decision. In this case, the decision and the reasons will be published with the Final Assessment Report containing the original recommendation.

10 Review of changes resulting from PIRs

Following completion of PIR recommendation investigation and implementation of approved changes, it is not intended that a PIR of the PIR will be completed. The PIR and delivery of PIR recommendations should have been completed in a manner sufficient to address the feasible change opportunities for community and industry stakeholders.

It is acknowledged and expected that not all communities and not all industry stakeholders will be supportive of the final outcomes, as these will involve trade-offs and decisions that will ultimately see aircraft operations over one location or another. These trade-offs and change decisions should have been transparently engaged on, explained and reported throughout both the PIR and the PIR Recommendations Implementation to the point that the community and industry are aware of the grounds for all final decisions.

An internal review will be completed six to 12 months after introduction of the final changes to confirm:

1. no increased safety risk or occurrences have resulted from the change
2. the new operations are working as expected
3. no unexpected negative consequences have resulted.

Additional success measures, specific to the change and its intent, may also be used in this internal review. These will be identified at the time of change implementation and will be shared as part of the pre-implementation communication program.

A summary of the internal review will be provided on Engage Airservices, marking the closure of the PIR process.

Where unexpected outcomes result, these will be discussed at the JIG and recommended actions progressed as a new change processed in accordance with ATS-PROC-0147.

11 Suggested Improvements Investigation

Following a PIR or at any time during an airport's operation, community members may wish to submit suggestions for investigation to reduce the impact of aircraft operations in their area. During a PIR, these suggestions are fed into the PIR considerations.

These suggestions will generally be submitted via the NCIS, Community Aviation Consultative Groups (CACGs) or direct to Community Engagement.

Many of the suggestions received for changes to existing operations can be from a single person wanting to remove aircraft operations from their location. This will often also mean putting operations over new communities and creating concerns and complaints in new locations.

For a suggested improvement to be investigated, it should address a problem that is being reported by a community as opposed to an individual. This will ensure that problems are not just shifted without a net benefit, while also ensuring Airservices' limited resources are allocated to changes that can provide the greatest positive outcome.

The process to be followed to assess if a suggested improvement should progress to full investigation, applying PROC-0147, is as follows:

1. Suggested improvement received through any channel

2. Identify the operation of concern

3. Request data from NCIS on complainant data for that airport location and the number of complainants that have made contact in relation to the identified operation of concern

4. Summarise suggested improvement and NCIS data into a brief, including an image of the operation of concern and the proposed solution and provide to the Head of Community Engagement for consideration

5. Head of Community Engagement to determine if the suggestion should be progressed following consideration of:

    a. Total number of complainants in the location

    b. Total complainants about this operation

    c. Proposed solution and its potential to broadly improve noise outcomes.

This initial assessment will be completed using the Initial Suggested Improvement Assessment template.

If the suggestion is determined suitable to progress, based on it potentially solving a wider community issue, Community Engagement will submit an ATS-FORM-0100 in accordance with ATS-PROC-0147 to initiate the Airspace Change Process. The suggester will be contacted by Community Engagement to advise that their suggestion has been accepted to progress for further investigation, with an anticipated timeframe.

If the suggestion is determined not suitable to progress (this could be as a result of Community Engagement Head or AGP determination), based on it not solving a wider community issue or due to the potential impacts of the proposed amendment being greater than the benefit it could provide, the suggester will be contacted by Community Engagement to advise that their suggestion has not been accepted to progress for further investigation, explaining the reasons for this.

12 Community support/opposition consideration in all changes

In the conduct of flight path and airspace changes, PIRs, PIR recommendations delivery and investigation of suggested improvements, situations will arise where community support and opposition to a proposed change is divided. This can make consideration of community views as part of decision-making more challenging.

While the Flight Path Design Principles are used to assess proposed changes with the aim of ensuring consideration of all factors and achieving a balanced outcome, community (and industry) feedback is also a consideration in this process to understand if the change will be accepted. As a benefit to one community may result in a disbenefit to another, feedback on a proposed change can be mixed.

Where feedback is considered almost evenly split for and against a proposed change – generally within 40 to 60 percent for either action – the following will be given regard in making the final decision.

- ☐ Noise level – which action results in the lowest noise level over communities or the fewest people affected at a higher noise level?

- ☐ Population density – which action results in less population being directly overflown (directly overflown refers to the 2km notional flight path corridor, runway end to waypoint)?

- ☐ Frequency – which action reduces the frequency of overflight or provides for fairer sharing of this overflight between communities?

- ☐ Sensitive receivers – what action results in fewer sensitive receivers (schools, aged care, places of worship, hospitals etc) being overflown?

Considerations should also give regard to the differential between existing background noise and the expected change. Locations with lower background noise will experience greater noticeability of a change that results in a 60dB(A) noise level for example, than an urbanised environment with higher existing background noise. Thus, the following should also be considered:

- ☐ Forecast noise level differential – which action results in the lowest differential between existing background noise and forecast noise events.

The original forecasts within the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) initially engaged on should be considered, with the aim of within reason, achieving the outcomes identified in the EIA.

- ☐ EIA forecast – which action results in the delivery of operations/impacts as forecast in the EIA?

By applying the above considerations, the aim is to identify the action that provides the best overall outcome in reducing impact on communities and the environment holistically.

13   Definitions

Within this document, the following definitions apply:

Term	Definition
ADC	Airspace Design Coordinator
AGP	Airspace Governance Panel
ATC	Air Traffic Control
AFPDM	Airspace and Flight Path Design Management
CAO	Chief Aerodromes Officer
CANO	Chief Airspace and Networks Officer
CASA	Civil Aviation Safety Authority
CEP	Community Engagement Plan
CER	Community Engagement Report
CES	Community Engagement Standard
CSA	Community Sensitivity Analysis
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
JIG	Joint Implementation Group
NAP	Noise Abatement Procedure
NCIS	Noise Complaints and Information Service
NMT	Noise Monitoring Terminal
NOS	National Operating Standard
PIR	Post Implementation Review
PNSA	Preliminary Noticeability and Sensitivity Assessment
SME	Subject Matter Expert
TOR	Terms of Reference