APPENDIX B - DESIGN PRINCIPLE EVALUATION TEMPLATE RNAV VPA OPTIONS

Design principle evaluation			Option No: B1	
Option Name: RNAV(GNSS) 3.0° Do nothi	ng		REJECT	
Description of option:		V approaches re	main at 3.0°	
Design principle: Must be safe	Not met	Partial	Met	
Summary of qualitative assessment: • Heathrow's 3.0° RNAV approaches as safe.	s were operationa	al for many years	s and demonstrated	
Design principle: Must achieve the objective of reducing noise compared to a 3.0° approach	Not met	Partial	Met	
Summary of qualitative assessment: • This would not reduce noise.				
			<u> </u>	
Design principle: Must not increase the numbers of go-arounds	Not met	Partial	Met	
Summary of qualitative assessment: • Heathrow's 3.0° RNAV approaches were operational for many years and demonstrated as not increasing the numbers of go-arounds.				
Design principle: Must not reduce Heathrow's capacity	Not met	Partial	Met	
Summary of qualitative assessment: • Heathrow's 3.0° RNAV approaches were operational for many years and demonstrated as not reducing Heathrow's capacity.				
Design principle: Must not change the lateral tracks of aircraft over the ground	Not met	Partial	Met	
Summary of qualitative assessment: • Heathrow's 3.0° RNAV approaches baseline for assessing changes to approaches.				



Design principle: Should not reduce the ability for arrivals to fly Continuous Descent Approach.

Not met Partial Met

Met

Summary of qualitative assessment:

Heathrow's 3.0° RNAV approaches were operational for many years and demonstrated as not reducing CDA performance.

Design principle: Should maximise the number of aircraft able to fly the slightly steeper approach

Summary of qualitative assessment:

• Would not allow any aircraft to fly slightly steeper approaches.

Design principle: Should not adversely increase pilot or ATC workload	Not met	Partial	Met

Summary of qualitative assessment:

• 3.0° RNAV approaches are safe although ATC workload is a limiting factor on the number of RNAV approaches that can be flown at Heathrow which means that numbers in excess of 2% is unlikely.

Design principle evaluation			Option No: B2
Option Name: RNAV(GNSS) 3.2°			ACCEPT
 Description of option: This option would see the Vertical Fincreased from 3.0° to 3.2°. The II arrivals fly RNAV approaches. Carried forward. 			
Design principles Must be sefe		_	
Design principle: Must be safe	Not met	Partial	Met
Summary of qualitative assessment: • Heathrow's trials demonstrated the increased (to 3.2°).	hat the RNAV	Vertical Path ar	igle can be safely
Decima minerale Mant achieve the			
Design principle: Must achieve the objective of reducing noise compared to a 3.0° approach	Not met	Partial	Met
Summary of qualitative assessment: • Heathrow's trials demonstrated ave approaches compared to 3.0° ILS a		ctions of 0.5dBA (SEL) for 3.2° RNAV
Design principle: Must not increase the numbers of go-arounds	Not met	Partial	Met
Summary of qualitative assessment: • Heathrow's trials demonstrated that as a result of 3.2° RNAV approached		creases in the nu	mber of go-arounds
Design principle: Must not reduce Heathrow's capacity	Not met	Partial	Met
Summary of qualitative assessment: • Heathrow's trials demonstrated that RNAV approaches. However, ATC approaches that can be flown at He	workload is a lin		
Design principle: Must not change the lateral tracks of aircraft over the ground	Not met	Partial	Met
Summary of qualitative assessment: • Heathrow's trials demonstrated that over the ground as a result of 3.2° leads to the second secon			ral tracks of aircraft



Design principle: Should not reduce the ability for arrivals to fly Continuous Descent Approach.	Not met	Partial	Met		
Summary of qualitative assessment: • Heathrow's trials demonstrated that there was no reduction in CDA performance as a					

Design principle: Should maximise the number of aircraft able to fly the slightly	Partial	Met
steeper approach		

Summary of qualitative assessment:

result of 3.2° RNAV approaches.

• Nearly all Heathrow's aircraft are capable of performing RNAV approaches although ATC workload is a limiting factor on the number of RNAV approaches that can be flown at Heathrow which means that numbers in excess of 2% is unlikely. (This workload increase is not expected to be a factor for Slightly Steeper ILS approaches).

Design principle: Should not adversely increase pilot or ATC workload	Not met	Partial	Met
-----------------------------------------------------------------------	---------	---------	-----

Summary of qualitative assessment:

• Heathrow's trials demonstrated that 3.2° RNAV approaches are safe although ATC workload is a limiting factor on the number of RNAV approaches that can be flown at Heathrow which means that numbers in excess of 2% is unlikely.

Cia	SSINCATION. Public				
Design principle evaluation			Option No: B3		
Option Name: RNAV(GNSS) 3.5°			REJECT		
 Description of option: This option would see the Vertical Findereased from 3.0° to 3.5°. The ILS When air temperature is above 15°0 would result in significantly less that Rejected 	S will remain at 3 C, these procedu	.0°. res would be una	vailable. This option		
Design principle: Must be safe	Not met	Partial	Met		
Summary of qualitative assessment: • No evidence available to support that 3.5° RNAV approaches at Heathrow are safe. However, a maximum VPA of 3.27° would only be permitted owing to the effect of temperature – this angle would cater for the hottest day on record at Heathrow.					
Design principle: Must achieve the objective of reducing noise compared to a 3.0° approach	Not met	Partial	Met		
 Summary of qualitative assessment: It is likely that 3.5° approaches would reduce noise at ground level during some portions of final approach but there is no evidence to support this. It is also likely that landing gear and flap deployment would change in order to manage the energy of the aircraft. This could result in more noise under some parts of final approach. 					
Design principle: Must not increase the numbers of go-arounds	Not met	Partial	Met		
Summary of qualitative assessment: • No evidence available to support the in go-arounds. Anecdotally, airlines angles greater than 3.2° in a high steeper approach trial reports.	s advised that ar	n increase in go-	arounds is likely for		
Docian principle: Must not reduce					
Design principle: Must not reduce	N1 - 4 4	Destist	N.4 - 4		

Design	principle:	Must	not	reduce			
Heathro	w's capacity	•			Not met	Partial	Met

Summary of qualitative assessment:

If an increase in go-arounds materialised, this would result in a reduction in Heathrow capacity. However, no evidence to support this at this time.

Design principle: Must not change the lateral tracks of aircraft over the ground	Not met	Partial	Met
Summary of qualitative assessment: • No evidence available to support the to the tracks over the ground.	at 3.5° RNAV app	oroaches would n	ot result in a change

Design principle: Should not reduce the ability for arrivals to fly Continuous Descent Approach.	Not met	Partial	Met
Summary of qualitative assessment:	U LOS° DNAN	,	

No evidence available to support that 3.5° RNAV approaches would not result in a reduction in CDA performance.

Design principle: Should maximise the number of aircraft able to fly the slightly steeper approach	Partial	Met
Summary of qualitative assessment:		

Concerns from operators as to the increased energy management would likely result in significantly less than 2% of Heathrow's arrivals flying the approach.

Design principle: Should not adversely increase pilot or ATC workload	Not met	Partial	Met

Summary of qualitative assessment:

No evidence to suggest an increase in pilot or ATC workload although an increase in pilot workload can be expected due to the increased energy and speed of the aircraft that would need to be managed by the pilot. Pilots will not be used to flying a 3.5° approach and as well as energy management on final approach they could have a longer flare and a greater discrepancy to the PAPIs to take account of.

Design principle evaluation	Option No: B4
Option Name: RNAV(GNSS) Segmented 4.5° to 3.2°	REJECT
Description of option:	
 This option is based on the live operational trials performed by Heathrow in 2015 although that saw a 4.5° approach reducing to 3.0 	

•	Would result in significantly less than 2% of Heathrow's arrivals flying the approach as
	they would require specific operator and crew certification to fly them.
	·

Design principle: Must be safe	Not met	Partial	Met
Summary of qualitative assessment:			

Summary of qualitative assessment:

The trials performed by British Airways in 2015 demonstrated that the concept was safe however they were limited in number and were performed during low traffic levels. There is no evidence available to support that segmented RNAV approaches at Heathrow are safe during a high intensity operation. Further evidence required.

Design principle: Must achieve the objective of reducing noise compared to a	Not met	Partial	Met
3.0° approach			

Summary of qualitative assessment:

There is no evidence that would enable Heathrow to claim an overall noise benefit with such approaches. The trials in 2015 did not measure noise impacts. It is likely that these approaches would reduce noise at ground level during some portions of final approach but there is no evidence to support this. It is also possible that landing gear and flap deployment would change in order to manage the energy of the aircraft. This could result in more noise under some parts of final approach. Further evidence required.

Design principle: Must not increase the numbers of go-arounds	Not met	Partial	Met
Summary of qualitative assessment: • No evidence available to support whether segmented approaches would result in an			

increase in the number of go-arounds or not. Further evidence required.

	reduce		
Heathrow's capacity	Not met	Partial	Met

Summary of qualitative assessment:

No firm evidence available to support that segmented approaches would result in a reduction in Heathrow capacity. Segmented approach trials did take place at Heathrow in limited conditions for a small number of flights with increased spacing between arrivals due to the potential for increased Vortex Wake encounters. Further evidence is required to understand the effect of such approaches on Heathrow's landing rates.

Design principle: Must not change the lateral tracks of aircraft over the ground	Not met	Partial	Met
 Summary of qualitative assessment: No evidence available to understar to the tracks over the ground. 	nd if segmented a	approaches woul	d result in a change

Design principle: Should not reduce the ability for arrivals to fly Continuous Descent Approach.		Partial	Met
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------	-----

Summary of qualitative assessment:

• No evidence available to understand if segmented approaches would result in a reduction in CDA performance.

Design principle: Should maximise the			
number of aircraft able to fly the slightly	Not met	Partial	Met
steeper approach			

Summary of qualitative assessment:

- In 2015, British Airways flew a limited number of segmented approaches into Heathrow
 under trial conditions on B777 aircraft. Whilst the procedures were flown safely, the
 spacing on final approach between subsequent aircraft was greatly increased to cater for
 a potential increase in Vortex Wake encounters. In addition, the pilots selected to fly the
 procedures were briefed and trained to fly the approaches for the trial period.
- Such approaches would require individual crew training and approval and therefore the numbers of approaches flown would be very low indeed as there would be a limited need for operators to train their crews to fly these approaches.
- This would result in significantly less than 2% of Heathrow's arrivals flying the approach.

Design principle: Should not adversely increase pilot or ATC workload	Not met	Partial	Met
-----------------------------------------------------------------------	---------	---------	-----

Summary of qualitative assessment:

• The complex nature of these approaches increases pilot workload on final approach and hence require individual crew training and approval because they are considered non-standard.