

SAOP Framework Briefing 17/11/2016, Telecon

Attendees

CAA
[REDACTED]

NATS
[REDACTED]

Apologies
[REDACTED]

NATS presented Slides on SAOP WP1.

It was noted that:

1. NATS will be required to provide a mitigation logic/strategy for RNAV turns in the ACP. NATS were advised that flyability was not required for the STARs but may be for the 'dislocated' en route holds. This could only be determined once designs/mitigations had been received.
2. NATS must provide mitigation for RNAV5 aircraft filing RNAV1 airways/STARs
3. Based on the pictures provided in the attached presentation which show no impact on tracks/routes at or below 7000ft amsl, there is no requirement to consult on local environmental impacts.
4. As there is no requirement for additional CAS there is no requirement to consult with the NATMAC/GA community
5. The identified stakeholders are the airports, MOD and airlines. NATS proposed that a 12 week consultation would not be necessary, given that the 12 week consultation period is specifically to allow for dissemination of information to local communities and GA stakeholders. This was agreed subject to NATS providing evidence of consultation/no objection from airports, MOD and airlines.

In the absence of [REDACTED] relayed comments from the Consultation Regulator regarding consultation:

[REDACTED] was broadly content that there is no formal consultation activity that now needs to be completed; however, the following NATS assertions need evidencing:

- Existing access to Danger Areas with AMC agreement that they can accommodate management of new CDRs (no MOD show stoppers).
- No objection from HAL or GAL.
- Support from operators .

[REDACTED] would look to see these issues addressed as part of NATS's formal submission.

6. ■ queried the claims that there would be an improvement in vertical profiles which in term would aid the overall fuel & CO2 benefit. ■ asked if this could be portrayed and the modelling undertaken to reach this conclusion be shared. [This was subsequently clarified by NATS in ■ email of 18 Nov which states "the statement in the FWB about profile improvements is a qualitative judgement from ATC. Their experience is that that level separation is used as a tactical measure, which means that aircraft are sometimes stepped down from their optimal levels."]
7. NATS agreed to provide the CO2 analysis that had been undertaken to support the proposal. [At the time of the meeting, the CAA had not had sight of that work.]
8. The CAA queried whether the changes to the Ockham hold would have the potential to affect any aircraft below 7,000ft. NATS was asked to consider this and confirm whether or not any traffic would be affected below 7,000ft by this element of the proposal.
9. NATS is seeking implementation in April 2017; however, CAA noted that this may not give sufficient time for conducting a regulatory assessment. The ACP would have to join the queue with other projects and the IFP regulatory task would have to be integrated into realistic timescales alongside other Case Officer IFP tasking. NATS agreed to deliver the ACP ASAP to give it its best chance of making April 2017.