

Swanwick Airspace Improvement Programme
Airspace Development 3
LAC S21/Jersey/Brest Interface

SAIP AD3
Gateway documentation:
Stage 1 Define

Assessment Meeting Minutes

Redacted

NATS

NATS Uncontrolled

Action	Position	Name	Acknowledged	Date
Produced	Airspace Change Assurance, NATS Future Airspace & ATM			05/02/18
Approved	ATC Lead – Airspace, NATS Swanwick ATM Development			05/02/18
Approved	Project Manager SAIP			05/02/18
Pending approval	SARG Case Officer			

NATS UNCLASSIFIED

© 2018 NATS (En-route) plc, ('NERL') all rights reserved

Publication history

Issue	Month/Year	Change Requests in this issue
Issue 1	Feb 2018	Submitted to SARG

Contents

Introduction.....	4
1. Stage 1 Assessment Meeting held 2 nd February 2018- Introduction.....	4
2. Statement of Need.....	4
3. Issues and benefits arising from proposed change.....	4
4. How to address identified issues.....	5
5. Provisional indication of the appropriate scaling level and notes re Process Requirements	5
6. Draft Timescales and Planned Gateway Assessments.....	6
7. Next steps	6
8. AOB.....	6
9. Confirmation of intent to proceed	6

Introduction

This document forms part of the document set required in accordance with the requirements of the CAP1616 airspace change process.

This document aims to provide adequate evidence to satisfy:
Stage 1 Define Gateway, Step 1A Assess Requirement

1. Stage 1 Assessment Meeting held 2nd February 2018- Introduction

- 1.1 The following CAA and NATS staff attended the meeting:

CAA (SARG) Attendees: 5x attendees, 1x apologies	NATS Attendees: 3x attendees
---	---------------------------------

- 1.2 A presentation was given by NATS to SARG, a copy is attached separately and will be available on the SARG portal.
- 1.3 The basic concept is to partly alter some traffic patterns in NATS Swanwick Sector 21 to fit with a new route structure set by Jersey Ports Authority and DSNA (France Brest), the ANSPs south of the FIR boundary in the region.

2. Statement of Need

- 2.1 The original Statement of Need (SoN) was submitted on form DAP1916 (ref DAP1916-157) and was discussed in the meeting.
- 2.2 A revised SoN, more closely following CAP1616 guidance, was also discussed. The text of that SoN was presented, agreed, and is to be submitted to SARG before Stage 1 Assessment Gateway.

Action NATS: Submit revised SoN

Action Closed 05/02/2018, ref DAP1916-400 supersedes 157.

3. Issues and benefits arising from proposed change

- 3.1 Charts were presented, illustrating the current-day arrangements (do-nothing baseline), as were charts showing a potential 'full S21 restructure' concept known to be a Level 1 change, and a preferred 'minimal S21 work' concept proposed to be a Level 2 change (see separate presentation slide pack).
- 3.2 The issues and benefits of the two concepts were laid out for each concept.
- 3.3 SARG highlighted that Jersey's flight procedures are contained within the UK AIP yet their regulation was not included under issues/benefits. Discussion ensued about Jersey's procedures also appearing in the French AIP and that Jersey's ANSP does not come under UK regulatory purview (however there is a natural relationship).
- 3.4 All agreed that only AIP information regulated by SARG was relevant to future discussions of scope for this proposal, i.e. the UK side of the FIR boundary.

4. How to address identified issues

- 4.1 Slides were presented (Summary, Engagement and Next Steps), stating how the issues are intended to be addressed. These include use of RNAV1 due to CAS containment near waypoint LELNA being 1.94nm instead of standard 2nm – this is regarded as safe, but a safety argument will be made.
- 4.2 Collaboration with the adjacent ANSPs is required, under tight timescales.
- 4.3 Process issues of fitting their timescales were identified (e.g. see para 5.3 below).

5. Provisional indication of the appropriate scaling level and notes re Process Requirements

- 5.1 **SARG** mentioned the specific wording of Level 1 vs. Level 2 changes and how the preferred draft concept may technically not meet Level 2, i.e. a small shift in a flightplan waypoint over the sea may cause a corresponding (albeit not noticeable) shift over the ground at lower levels. Discussion ensued with NATS stating that the plan was firmly to ensure the change would fit Level 2 criteria, specific version of Level 2 TBC, and that if the draft concept was unlikely to meet Level 2 then the proposal would be modified until SARG is satisfied.
- 5.2 In the meeting, the slide pack stated that Level 2A was NATS' intent.
Writer's note (**NATS**): Level 2B may be more appropriate because the changes would all occur over the sea – please see previous paragraph.

Action **NATS**: Provide radar track evidence demonstrating that existing Solent departure flows would not be impacted by the proposal over land below 7,000ft.

- 5.3 Due to timescales, NATS will make the argument that the major operators will be engaged and consulted directly instead of via typical 12-week NATMAC consultation. These will be limited to Solent-Channel Islands operators because those are the ones primarily impacted. Evidence will be supplied showing the operators and their proportions.

Action **NATS**: Acquire analysis of operators routeing between the Solent and the Channel Islands. This will form the basis of NATS' planned argument to reduce the number of operators we need to engage, to just the 'major carriers', leading to a targeted consultation. In advance of that analysis, NATS expects FlyBE to be the most frequent carrier (with Blue Islands operating their Guernsey route), and also Aurigny.

- 5.4 NATS requests the CAA acknowledge that, as part of this cross-border collaboration, there are negotiations and inter-ANSP operational development agreements between NATS, Jersey Ports Authority and DSNA which **may not technically comply with all UK-based CAP1616 items** as specified.
- 5.5 NATS will follow CAP1616 under the pragmatic guidance of SARG, and will bring to SARG's attention areas where we need to **agree alternate methods of compliance**, due to the circumstances of this three-ANSP airspace improvement collaboration with limited time to their planned implementation.

6. Draft Timescales and Planned Gateway Assessments

6.1 The draft plan is as follows:

Gateway	Gateway Assessment date	Document Deadline
Stage 1 Define	23/02/18	09/02/18
Stage 2 Develop & Assess	23/03/18	09/03/18
Stage 3 Consult	27/04/18	13/04/18
Stage 4 Update & Submit ACP	18/05/18 (not a Gateway)	-
Stage 5 Decide	CAA internal, suggest 27/07/18	-
AIS Deadline for Data	09/08/2018 (single AIRAC)	09/08/2018
Stage 6 Implement	08/11/2018 (AIRAC12)	-

Table 1 NATS' plans for the Gateway Assessments

7. Next steps

7.1 Additional analysis is in progress. This will assist in stakeholder engagement.

7.2 Draft stakeholder engagement plan:

- Continued collaboration with Jersey and DSNA ANSPs will refine the detail of the proposal based on the preferred concept option. We reiterate the fact that the preferred concept option was arrived at by collaboration with these ANSPs which are not considered 'stakeholders' per se. NATS intends to progress this along with their plan to implement new arrangements in November 2018.
- Airlines: See para 5.3 above.
- MoD: NATS will engage MoD via DAATM and will present an updated concept based on the preferred option. There are no predicted impacts on MoD and NATS is confident that the concept will not raise any objections.

8. AOB

8.1 None

9. Confirmation of intent to proceed

9.1 NATS confirms that, in collaboration with Jersey and DSNA ANSPs, we intend to proceed with the development of this proposal.

End of document