



MINUTES NASCOM 2 / 2026

20 May 2026 at 10h00
CAA, Ikhaya Lokundiza
12 Byls Bridge Boulevard,
Building No 2, Byls Bridge
Office Park, Centurion ,

ANNEXURE B

ATTENDANCE LIST

OFFICIAL	COMPANY	CONTACT NUMBERS	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Ms. T. Maphike	SACAA	072 300 8617	Maphiket@caa.co.za
Ms. B. Mathobela	SACAA	011 454 1441	Mathobelab@caa.co.za
Mr. V. Nkosi	SACAA	066 470 2188	Nkosiv@caa.co.za
Ms. S. Mbatha	SACAA	011 545 1658	Mbathasi@caa.co.za
Mr. J. Davis	ATNS	066 304 3246	Jamesd@atns.co.za
Mr. K. Storie	CAASA	082 382 3276	Kev@caasa.co.za
Mr. Z. Cira	SACAA	011 545 1562	Ciraz@caa.co.za
Ms. J. Prins	DoT	082 857 7931	Prinsj@dot.gov.za
Ms. I. Mabala	SACAA	011 545 1023	Mabalae@caa.co.za
Mr. V. Lochan	AASA	071 896 1398	Vlochan@aasa.za.net
Mr. M. Cooper	ATNS	079 500 8847	Martinc@atns.co.za
Mr. J. Adriaan	MOGAS	079 030 6500	jason@ddasolutions.co.za
Ms. P. Kganyago	DoT	012 309 3330	Kganyagop@dot.gov.za
Mr. W. Doubell	Aero Club	079 830 6452	Walter@aeroclub.org.za
Mr. K. Sim	ACSA	082 775 0315	Kenton.sim@airports.co.za
Ms. S. May	SACAA	011 545 1065	Mays@caa.co.za
Mr. D. Joubert	ATNS	079 517 6863	DaveJ@atns.co.za
Mr. T. Masuku	SACAA	011 545 1000	Masukut@caa.co.za
Mr. T. Matabane	SACAA	011 545 1066	Matabanet@caa.co.za
Mr. R. Kleyn	Atlantic Aerodrome	083 297 7070	rihan@mavericks.co.za
<u>APOLOGIES</u>			
Official	Company	Contact Numbers	E-Mail Address
Ms. J. Malope	DoT	012 309 3561	Malopej@dot.gov.za
Ms. T. Mahuwa	DoT	012 399 3020	mahuwat@dot.gov.za
Ms. L. Venter	SACAA	083 451 2645	Venterl@caa.co.za
Mr. S. Maphanga	SACAA	011 545 1194	Maphangas@caa.co.za
Ms. S. Bruce	BARSA	076 150 9233	Sarah.bruce@barsa.co.za
<u>ABSENT</u>			
Ms. A. Dana-Mfikili	DFFE	071 256 5048	Adana-mfikili@dffe.gov.za

	ACTION BY
1. OPENING The meeting was opened by the Chairperson, Ms. T. Maphike.	ALL
2. APOLOGIES Refer to Annexure B: Attendance List.	ALL
3. ANNOUNCEMENTS The Chairperson announced that from the SACAA side, a new inspector has joined the team under the Air Traffic Services Section. She also announced that a new member Mogas has joined NASCOM and that their membership was recently approved from the DCA's office.	Chairperson
4. SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS 4.1 Overflight Rules – Blyde River Canyon Resort; World Heritage Site - Worcester (Western Cape) Aeroclub and MOGAS reported that concerns had been raised regarding the long-standing overflight restriction applicable to the Blyde River Canyon area and Worcester, which requires aircraft to maintain a minimum altitude of 2,500 feet above the highest point of the terrain. The required intervention is for SACAA to keep the enforcement action in abeyance as the operations are not within SACAA jurisdictions. The Blyde river canyon is in the Hoedspruit area, which is under the military control, with glider operations at Worcester being seasonal. It was indicated that glider operations do not have any environmental impact in the area. After intense deliberations, the meeting concluded that a meeting be held with SACAA legal department regarding enforcement and affected parties to share letters with their concerns to be forwarded to DFFE via the DoT. The letters will also be discussed at inter-departmental meeting between DoT and DFFE. 4.2 Feedback on New Parks Mr. Storie reported that he attended a meeting on 21 April 2026 regarding the proposed Grassland National Park and its associated airspace implications. The meeting included representatives from SANParks, the DFFE, the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), and other stakeholders. He noted lack of aviation expertise and willingness to collaborate on aviation activities. The meeting did not show willingness to accommodate the conventional minimum altitude of 1000 feet above ground level, as proposed by aviation, citing the NEMPAA that obliges them to enforce 2500 feet above ground.	Aeroclub/ MOGAS CAASA

He indicated that authorities showed willingness to consider corridors as this was previously accommodated at the Cradle of Humankind in the Lanseria area, with no timelines provided. The corridors would need to be consulted with airspace users.

He expressed concern that the proposed Grassland National park would have significant implications for aviation operations and stated that the authorities were unable to provide clear answers regarding the impact on emergency services and other essential aviation activities. He further lamented the late distribution of the proposed site which are processed without inputs from aviation.

5. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The Chairperson proposed that the non-NASCOM members who have submitted applications be allowed to present first so that they can be excused from the meeting thereafter. The agenda item for the applicants was 8.3.

Chairperson

The agenda was approved with the proposed change.

6. APPROVAL OF NASCOM MINUTES (1/2026)

The minutes were approved as a true reflection of the meeting.

ALL

7. MATTERS ARISING/ PENDING AGENDA ITEMS

7.1 DFFE INFORMATION AND INTENDED DECLARATION ACTIVITY

The DFFE was not present in the meeting with no updates provided. The Secretariat reported that the SACAA had been tasked with publishing charts and the process is ongoing.

DFFE

She reported that the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) had released the latest South African Protected Airspace Database at the end of April 2026. The database was under review to update National Parks and World Heritage Sites charts. It was noted that submission for verification with cartography personnel was scheduled for Friday, 22 May 2026, after which the updated charts would be published on the SACAA website.

Mr. Masuku reported that the SACAA had previously been responsible for producing all aeronautical charts in-house. He explained that this responsibility has since shifted, with ATNS now handling chart production. He emphasised that the SACAA has withdrawn from producing charts to focus on its oversight mandate.

The Chairperson asked where the responsibility for chart production would be moved if the CAA could not continue with it.

Mr. Masuku recommended that NASCOM consider approaching ATNS to assist with chart production.

Mr. Storie, speaking from the users' perspective, highlighted a serious predicament in South Africa where separate entities are responsible for managing airspace under their control. He noted that the state had not resolved this issue, and users' risk being penalised by the DFFE and parks due to fragmented data. He stressed the need for consolidated airspace management under one authority, pointing out that fragmented control undermines airport development planning and pilot safety.

Mr. Storie cautioned that the DFFE is expanding protected airspace annually, which is becoming untenable and leaves pilots without reliable charts. He warned that this situation could lead to accidents or legal liability.

He argued that responsibility for airspace charts should rest with the DFFE or the authority managing the airspace, ensuring integration into digital mapping systems used by industry. He emphasised that ATNS or SACAA should not bear this responsibility, as oversight is SACAA's role.

The Chairperson acknowledged the recommendations made, particularly those from Mr. Masuku. She noted that ATNS currently manages the database but suggested that DFFE should take responsibility since they oversee airspace depictions. A conversation between ATNS and DFFE was proposed to clarify responsibilities.

Action/Decision

- The DFFE to keep NASCOM informed on new developments
- The DFFE to communicate the dates for departmental committee meetings to NASCOM Secretariat for distribution to NASCOM members
- SACAA to engage DFFE regarding the management of the database

DFFE
DFFE
Chairperson

7.2 National Airports Dev. Plan (NADP)

Mr. Storie provided feedback, thanking members for their assistance. He noted that the correspondence in the government gazette regarding where comments should be submitted was not clearly articulated and exact contact details should be indicated in the document.

DoT

He emphasized that the document under discussion relied heavily on data dating back to 2008–2009. He raised a concern that basing current planning on such outdated information would be detrimental to South Africa. He reported that he had submitted significant comments on the document and his concerns are on pages 81 to 170 of the gazette.

Ms. Kganyago clarified that comments must be submitted to the Department of Transport Director, Ms. Letlhogonolo Mashiteng. She confirmed that this information had been provided by the secretariat, although it was not reflected in the gazette. She assured members that going forward, the correct contact details would be included.

Action/Decision • DoT to keep NASCOM updated of the developments.	DoT
7.3 Spectrum Feedback Mr. Matabane highlighted potential interference in the 4200-4400 Hz band, noting that such interference could not easily be controlled and would depend on when it occurred. He indicated that the use of 5G was relatively new at present, with no further updates from his side. Ms. May referred to the action item concerning the impact on frequencies 4200 to 4400 MHz, that SACAA CNS to include the issue of interference with altimeters around OR Tambo as a point of discussion in the next meeting of the working groups and to provide feedback to NASCOM. Mr. Matabane emphasized that frequency interference developments were ongoing and had a direct impact on airspace communication. He concluded that future meetings would provide clarity on how updates should be structured, and any new developments would be reported accordingly. Mr. Matabane highlighted that, unlike SARAO colleagues who have real-time monitoring capabilities, South African airports rely on limited equipment and occasional support from ACSA when investigating interference. He stressed that the current situation is more about raising awareness of potential risks, while continuing to prioritize safety and monitoring for any actual occurrences.	SACAA
Action/Decision • SACAA CNS to keep NASCOM updated on Spectrum developments.	SACAA
7.4 SARAO/SKA feedback Mr. Davis reported that the Technical Working Group (TWG) Subgroup (SG) impact analysis activities are still ongoing. The SG is busy with the conduct of Spectrum and Radio Frequency Interference (RFI) related analysis including the review of ATNS and SAWS CNS infrastructure, supporting subsystems infrastructure in the vicinity of the SKA. The objectives include to quantify the ATNS and SAWS national infrastructure footprint to support the conduct of RFI analysis. Review of ATM operations including airspace concept, route network the conduct of the air traffic movements statistical analysis is underway mainly focused on upper airspace performance and considering the ATS route density performance. Additionally, the conduct of air traffic movements statistical analysis in and out of the busiest airports, FAOR and FACT to quantify potential RFI.	DoT

General Aviation (GA) operations including recreational operations in the vicinity of the SKA is being analysed with the objective to quantify the operations impact on SKA including potential RFI with the objective to consider impact mitigation concepts.

SG will compile a prelim report potentially by July in preparation for the TWG meeting and steering committee meetings respectively.

Mr Davis further reported that ongoing analysis of interference experienced by SARAO shows that the highest levels are associated with aviation infrastructure and traffic along the busiest routes between Cape Town and Lanseria, as well as aircraft movements into and out of Johannesburg and Cape Town. Current findings indicate that interference levels during both day and night operations remain very low.

He noted that SARAO is still assessing what levels of interference are acceptable and unacceptable. To date, no interference has saturated SARAO's receivers, allowing scientific operations to continue without disruption. The analysis also confirms that aviation spectrum remains protected.

Mr Davis further advised that Phase 2 project installations will commence in the Northern Cape and Western Cape areas. While VHF spectrum interference has been found to be minimal, some concerns remain regarding microwave links used for data transmission where fibre infrastructure is unavailable.

Alternative connectivity solutions are being explored, and operators in the area are subject to certain restrictions. Despite these challenges, all SKA-related project activities and implementation plans remain on track.

Mr. Storie raised a concern about the absence of survey data. He noted that no data from operators had been shared yet and cautioned against proceeding to meetings without industry data, suggesting that such an approach would be ineffective. He also highlighted the financial consequences of aviation activity in the area.

Mr. Davis clarified that data collection from industry operations was intended to quantify the level of RFI being experienced. This would help track and recommend mitigation measures. He emphasized that the meeting report was only a status update, not a complete representation of all findings.

Mr. Matabane explained that the survey issue originated from SARAO's insistence on certain matters. SARAO had suggested designing a survey to present to industry for agreement. He confirmed that the survey was still forthcoming.

He further clarified that not all aviation services were causing damage to SARAO's equipment. He noted that ATC and pilot receivers were not significantly affected. However, technical involvement had revealed the extent of emissions and interference.

Mr. Matabane explained that aviation bands would continue to operate, but emissions would cause persistent interference. He gave the example of Distance Measuring

Equipment (DME) emissions, which could not be redesigned out of airspace, but suggested operational adjustments such as resting equipment at certain times to reduce excessive RFI.

He confirmed that the TWG was working toward a detailed report for the steering committee, which would guide amendments to gazetted regulations based on technical agreements between aviation and SARAO.

Mr. Davis concluded by stating that aviation systems remained unchanged and continued to follow industry requirements. Projects and training were proceeding as planned, with no current need for operational changes based on SARAO's input.

He emphasized that the TWG's role was to provide recommendations, and any future requirements for aviation changes would be processed through the committee. He reaffirmed that protected aviation spectrum would remain safeguarded.

Action/Decision

- ATNS to keep NASCOM on all developments.

ATNS

7.5 ATM/CNS Implementation Committee

Mr. Davis reported that the ATM CNS Implementation Committee has been restructured and is now referred to as AASPG. He noted that all previous activities and processes under the ATM CNS Implementation Committee are now obsolete. A decision was taken to dissolve all working groups and clear all projects. Consequently, the sharing of minutes from the former committee is no longer required.

ATNS

He reminded members that the original objective of the ATM CNS Committee was to track and report AASPG conclusions and decisions. However, since restructuring means projects will follow NASCOM processes directly, he recommended that NASCOM remove the ATM CNS Implementation Committee as a standing agenda item.

Ms. May sought clarification on whether the work previously undertaken by ATM CNS subgroups would now be submitted to NASCOM or SACAA for approval. She expressed concern that without reporting, NASCOM would lose oversight of developments in the ATM CNS space. She emphasized that receiving minutes had allowed NASCOM to remain informed of projects, state-level responses to AASPG conclusions, and airspace matters.

Mr. Davis clarified that when airspace projects requiring changes or infrastructure enhancements were ready for implementation, they were managed within the ATM CNS Implementation Committee, with ATNS acting as the airspace manager. Such projects would then be brought to NASCOM. He emphasized that NASCOM had previously required status updates from the committee's working groups, even though this was not the committee's original objective. The reporting on regional projects was done by the CAA to the regional office. He explained that when projects involve airspace changes, they would naturally come to NASCOM for consideration. Implementation activities now

involve a broader range of stakeholders, including airports, the SACAA, airspace stakeholders and ATNS. He further advised that the previous model under which matters were channelled through the committee had been dissolved and that no further matters of that nature would originate from NASCOM.

Mr. Storie suggested that NASCOM could gain early awareness of upcoming projects through the annual OPSCOM meeting. He proposed that minutes from OPSCOM, which involve industry and the CAA, be shared with NASCOM. This would provide visibility of projects in advance, and as projects progressed, NASCOM would be informed of the airspace elements involved.

The Chairperson concluded that sufficient discussion had taken place and that members were satisfied that the matter did not fall within NASCOM's responsibility. It was agreed that relevant developments and activities could be reported through OPSCOM, and the matter was closed on that basis.

Action/Decision

- Secretariat to update the agenda to remove the ATM/CNS Implementation Committee.

Secretariat

8. NEW AGENDA ITEMS

8.1 IP - FAJO Oceanic FIR (AORRA) ATS Routes

An IP was presented seeking the endorsement of the FAJO Oceanic FIR (AORRA) ATS Routes. The information is regarding the withdrawal of the 525 conventional routes.

ATNS

Action/Decision

- NASCOM noted the submission with no objections.

ALL

8.2 WP - FAPE SRA: AIP ENR 2.2 Amendments

A WP was presented for the approval of the FAPE SRA: AIP ENR 2.2 Amendments.

ATNS

Action/Decision

- NASCOM recommended the WP for approval by the DCA.

ALL

8.3 Atlantic Aerodrome Application

A WP was presented for the approval of the Atlantic Aerodrome Application. No objections were raised subject to all necessary stakeholders being consulted.

Atlantic
Aerodrome

Action/Decision NASCOM gave a conditional recommendation subject to all relevant stakeholders being consulted.	ALL
9. CLOSURE OF MEETING 9.1 Next Meeting (NASCOM 3/2026) The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, 19 August 2026. The deadline for submission is Friday, 10 July 2026. Ms. T Maphike (Chairperson)	ALL