

Swanwick Airspace Implementation Programme (SAIP) – AD1

Framework Briefing follow-on

22nd March 2017

Present

██████████) – CAA ██████████ – NATS
██████████) – CAA ██████████) – NATS
██████████ – CAA ██████████) – NATS

Apologies

██████████ – CAA ██████████ – CAA

INTRODUCTION

NATS presented a series of PowerPoint slides and this formed the basis of the re-named SAIP Framework Briefing (FWB) discussion (Slides attached) which updated the FWB of the previously named SAOP Module 1 held on 17 November 2016.

██████████ ran through CAP725 process with CAP1385 & CAP1378 also covered.

CHANGES AND UPDATES FROM SAOP FRAMEWORK BRIEFING HELD ON 7 NOVEMBER 2016

Some portions of new and existing ATS Routes will be designated RNAV1 and others RNAV5 - Does this present a problem if the same route changes its designation?

- NATS to ask database providers LIDO and Jeppesen and get answer back to CAA.

M184/5 route splits at FIR boundary. DSNAs to present traffic level separated at DIKRO as per today. LoA and operating procedures will facilitate this.

██████████ advised that the ACP should state the benefits created as a consequence of this, namely level caps will be raised/removed as routes are split early.

This is also the one area where the U designator prefix will be retained along with the other routes through D036-D040 due to different CDR Status above/below FL195 compounded by independent applicability rules.

On proposed routes (U)M184 and (U)M185, Birmingham and East Midlands (BB/NX) and Stansted and Luton (SS/GW) inbounds will retain a 7NM split as a consequence of RNAV-1 routes so 'when ready' descents (subject to controller workload) can be issued. This is another benefit which improves the actual descent profile.

R/T commands likely to be reduced by 50% where pairs of inbounds arrive together.

NATS covered options A to C for lowering controlled airspace (CAS) in the English Channel for SS/GW inbound (see slide pack). These will be presented in a separate airspace change proposal with a separate FWB, consultation and ACP. ■ advised that a DAP1916 needs to be submitted so that a Case Officer can be allocated. However due to resource constraints this may take some time.

CAS containment

General discussion around this subject.

Current regulations state that 3NM is to be used with NATS looking to reduce this to 2NM.

NATS discussed additional evidence by ■ (NATS) and ■ felt that subject to this evidence (and its subsequent acceptance by the CAA) which uses new data superseding the 95% certainty criteria which the current 3NM policy is based on, it should be acceptable for the CAA to make a ruling in this instance to reduce CAS containment to 2NM. This would be followed by submission from NATS for a proposal for a policy change on this matter. The PBN research project data is to be used to make this argument. The CAA will assess the merits of this supporting evidence at the case study.

- ■ to check with Mgr AR ■ that this approach of ACP justification and airspace change first with formal proposal for a policy change second, is acceptable

CAA ISP (■) may need to make a decision on the policy change. Mgr AR ■ is likely to decide if this is a requirement.

Discussed D036/D037/D038 buffer and how it is internal to the Danger Area (DA) when the DA is active. NATS view was that when it is inactive, aircraft need to be 2NM clear between FL105-FL125 as it is a CAS boundary. But they can be adjacent to the DA when it is hot (due to the internal built in buffer).

CAA advised that this needs to go into the ACP as mitigation for aircraft with 2NM separation when in the turn. The CAA will assess the merits of this supporting evidence at the case study.

Terminology

STARs will have current terminology of expected descent levels. ■ stated that this has caused issues in some states but as it's accepted form in the UK, it is acceptable for NATS to keep to this standard. Therefore, NATS will retain current STAR terminology.

Fuel Saving Measurement

Discussion with ■ about fuel saving and uplift etc. Concluded that if fuel uplift is the calculation currently used to derive benefit then until that changes we need only put current route v proposed route and show fuel saving or otherwise. No need to cover current tactical routing in benefits analysis. However, the CAA requested that NATS include current track mileage comparisons.

5LNCs

- NATS – advised that ADNID will be moved to the FIR boundary and swapped with another 5LNC (now agreed post FWB that this will be LUGIS).

Presentation Slide Corrections

- NATS – to change terminology on slides referencing 'at and below' for hold levels as per DfT Guidance

STAR Speed Limits

Speed Limit Points (SLPs) on STARs are not changing, expected aircraft will behave (speed wise) as today and new STARs will have similarly located SLPs

Discussion on RNAV STARs into RNAV holds etc.

The policy on converting conventional holds and Standard Arrival Routes (STARs) to RNAV was discussed.

If holds and STARs are to be removed as they are contingency only, then this needs to go in the commentary.

Several scenarios / combinations were presented by NATS for discussion and clarification from the CAA was sought as follows:

RNAV STAR into conventional hold

RNAV STAR into RNAV hold (future proofing for VOR rationalisation)

Conventional STAR into RNAV hold

Removing alternates

- NATS – to put all of the above options into a question for ■ so that he can get an official position for the project from the CAA
- NATS – to ask database suppliers if they can code more than one hold per RP, specifically RNAV and conventional
- ■ to decide if this is the time to start a phased approach to ICAO compliant designation/naming of STARs. Beginning with new RNAV1 STARs and a review of some RNAV1 LAMP STARs which may need re-designation.

Discussion regarding one sector boundary change where a small portion of airspace will transfer from a LTC Sector (where 3NM radar separation can be provided) to an LAC Sector (where technically 5NM radar separation is required). The discussion point – LTC will still work traffic and be aware of all traffic in the airspace.

Therefore, can LTC still operate to 3NM separation?

■ stated that it may need to be mentioned in the ACP and may require additional safety assurance to be submitted.

- ■ will advise if additional safety assurance work is required and what that may look like.

Floating holds

ACP must present evidence of airline engagement and that they are content with floating hold concept.

- NATS – to check that database coders are happy with floating database concept

CAA stated that they find the concept acceptable as long as the floating holds are a contingency and rarely used and that the MATS part 2 / operating procedures make it clear that the pilot workload is high when they are asked to use them so pilots need as much notice as possible.

NATS felt it preferable for the Floating Holds to be depicted by way of an inset on the relevant STAR Chart(s) so that they can be quickly assessed by flight crews and entered into the FMS efficiently.

Consultation list

Evidence from Aircraft Operators and the MOD will be required as well as the questions they were asked and what was shown/talked about.

As this is a follow on FWB, some engagement and consultation has continued in the interim:

- NATS – to write to ■ with details of the on-going engagements which have taken place, who with, how and when, so that he can advise if action to date is acceptable.

Training

Training requirements to be documented and sent to ■ so that he can approve the training plan.

Training evidence to be submitted to SARG by 31st July 2017

AIS submission date to be 11th August 2017

- ■ to confirm if draft AIP changes can be submitted after the ACP has been submitted however he did state that he is unwilling to duplicate effort and so is not prepared to look at anything which may be subject to change at a later date.

House Keeping Actions

E32975 to be withdrawn

NATS to submit a new DAP1916 to be called Portsmouth CTA (completed 23rd March 2017 - E36887 refers)

- ■ - SAIP Airspace Deployment 1 (DAP1917) to be returned to NATS for payment
- ■ – checking with ■ whether a NATS ATM Development Team member can work for one day per week or when required with SARG at CAA House.