

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 May 2017 21:44
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Letter from [REDACTED] : Route2andRoute5RNAVSIDModificationsToGAL

Hi [REDACTED] Yes the team will provide accordingly.

Cheers

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Head Airspace Strategy & Engagement

7th Floor, Destinations Place

Office: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

YOUR LONDON AIRPORT
Gatwick

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 May 2017 14:11
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Letter from [REDACTED] : Route2andRoute5RNAVSIDModificationsToGAL

[REDACTED]

Thanks. We are now Ok with the use of Casper. And were you Ok with the complaint data we provided in para 3 of my e mail?

Regards,

[REDACTED]

Airspace Regulator, AAA, SARG
CAA House, 45-59 Kingsway, London WC2B 6TE

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 May 2017 12:55
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Letter from [REDACTED] : Route2andRoute5RNAVSIDModificationsToGAL

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for your note below. Regarding the use of Casper for complaint data capture specific to Route 5.

You are correct in your point below, there is a process the team undertakes. Even with Route 4 using the e-mail address we could never really be sure that people were providing feedback on an aircraft flying the route because the public are not always completely aware of what such a nuanced change might mean. For example we have received complaints about Route 4 on days when runway 08 was in operation. Using Casper allows us to be more specific about what traffic is actually involved. In the

case of Route 5 departures our process will use the day of operation as a discerning factor and then the particular aircraft that has been tagged or where free text in the complaint allows this to be identified either specifically as Route 5 or more generally as a departure; but to be clear this text does not need to specifically mention route 5. We can determine from the location of the complaint whether the aircraft is a departure and thus the SID.

With regard to what information we plan to provide as standard for Route 5 each month:

- METAR data
- SID usage and track deviation data and mapping
- Altitude breakdown mapping
- Track density mapping
- Complaint location mapping
- Details of any specific feedback from airlines and ATC (as requested through FLOPSC).
- We will also provide by exception detail of those aircraft types and/or airlines considered outliers in terms of performance, but not necessarily non-conformance (ie they may still be within the NPR but be subject to review).

Hope this answers your questions. We have completed our first Route 5 review meeting and you can expect the data package from the first month by the end of this week.

Cheers

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

7th Floor, Destinations Place

Office: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

YOUR LONDON AIRPORT
Gatwick

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 28 April 2017 09:14

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Letter from [REDACTED] : Route2andRoute5RNAVSIDModificationsToGAL

[REDACTED]

Due to leave with a number of colleagues, there has been a delay in following this up. We will re-issue the letter to the CEO; before we do, a few queries on your suggestions:

1, Paragraph 6. Regarding Casper complaint gathering for Route 5. Could you please explain how you know complaints related to Route 5 are captured as such. When we viewed the Casper complaint system yesterday, it seemed there was no way a complainant would register a specific complaint on a Route 5 departure. How do you differentiate between your complaints received? Appreciate there may be a process not apparent to us just by looking at your website. Maybe a phone call may make it easier to explain?

2. Paragraph 2. We agree to your proposal is to allow your internal process to capture any 'outliers' and present these types of data 'by exception'.

3. In view of our experience in analysing the excel spreadsheet data, we have made some modifications to the data. Here is a list of what details should be recorded. Additional classifications can also be used if it aids your analysis:

- Date & time
- Full name of individual or organisation
- Full postal address
- Full postcode
- Location (e.g. area, town, village etc.). This is to be derived from mapping the postcode (i.e. identifying the actual location by identifying the given postcode on a map) rather than relying upon the respondent's provided postal address or the generic location based on a postcode database (or similar).
- Issue raised by (any generic themes to be decided by sponsor)
- Cause of issue

Regards,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Airspace Regulator, AAA, SARG
CAA House, 45-59 Kingsway, London WC2B 6TE

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 March 2017 09:12
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Letter from [REDACTED] : Route2andRoute5RNAVSIDModificationsToGAL

Morning [REDACTED]

Thanks for clarifying the data collection requirements included in the [REDACTED] note. Based on our discussion yesterday I would also like to offer the following on the data collection requirements:

It was suggested under paragraph 6 that an e-mail address be established to capture Route 5 feedback. We believe that using Casper to fulfil the feedback function is a more appropriate method. The benefits of Casper include:

It is a method that is known to local communities and is simple to use. Many may not be aware of Route 5 but wish to complain about a Route 5 flight, this will ensure capture of all Route 5 complaints.

It is completely transparent, external stakeholders are able to find precise details of flights and look at other complaints dynamically.

It provides a single conduit avoiding duplication between an e-mail address and Casper which occurred during Route 4.

It provides a greater detail of information, such as the 'scattergraph' complaint plots you have requested.

It is much simpler to extract detail and also cut the data in different ways if the data capture requirement changes.

It is easier to create comparisons for example for different scenarios and timeframes.

I think if we moved away from Casper it may, in part, undermine the efforts and case we have been putting for a single, transparent tool which provides industry and external stakeholders with an excellent level of functionality and knowledge.

With regard to data plots, at paragraph 2, broken down by each aircraft type and each airline. This is a significant amount of effort. The data requests for additional information for Route 4 last month on its own took 2 of the team just over 2 full weeks to complete. It is an intensive task. I think that the change to Route 5 is a different proposition and we are very unlikely to have the degree of variation that we saw on Route 4, which is why different data sets were appropriate. My proposal is to allow our internal process to capture any 'outliers' and present these types of data 'by exception'.

Following our discussions on internal process for Route 4 we have established an internal performance clearing house meeting. At the end of each month, once the data has been collated we will identify anomalies through the clearing house. We will add data (ie airlines and/or aircraft type specific data) to the submission to the CAA if any anomalies are identified. This will also act as a trigger for engagement with airlines where performance issues are identified.

We will also be engaging more proactively with airlines and ANS and NATS. We will be presenting notices at the FLOPSC – scheduled for 29 March – to request feedback on Route 5 related operational issues. We will continue to seek feedback through FOPSC members for the duration of the trial.

With the above in mind I would request the following:

Casper be used as the method for data capture for all Route 5 complaints.
That the specific data plots be produced by exception rather than as a matter of course.

Let me know what you think, happy to discuss if that would help.

Cheers

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

7th Floor, Destinations Place

Office: [Redacted]

Mobile: [Redacted]

Email: [Redacted]

YOUR LONDON AIRPORT
Gatwick

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 23 March 2017 13:35

To: [Redacted]

[Redacted]

Subject: FW: Letter from [Redacted] : Route2andRoute5RNAVSIDModificationsToGAL

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 March 2017 09:41
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Letter from [REDACTED] : Route2andRoute5RNAVSIDModificationsToGAL

Dear [REDACTED]

Please find attached letter and log from [REDACTED]. Hard copy in the post today.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Executive Personal Assistant: Group Director
Safety & Airspace Regulation
Civil Aviation Authority

[REDACTED]

www.caa.co.uk

Follow us on Twitter: [@UK_CAA](https://twitter.com/UK_CAA)