

**APPENDIX 9 – GH5 ?9<C@89F': 998657?'  
F979=J98**

**FEEDBACK FROM LUFTHANSA**

Dear all

I fully agree with your options.  
3.2° would be the best compromise regarding to turbulence, speed reduction and stabilisation on the final approach.

Best regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

CMD A320 / SFE

Flight Ops Navigation & Charting  
ZRH AO/PC-A

Lufthansa Group  
Austrian Airlines, Lufthansa, SWISS

Swiss International Air Lines Ltd  
P.O. Box ZRHAO/PCA/EGCJ  
CH-8058 Zurich Airport  
Switzerland

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

lufthansagroup.com

**FEEDBACK FROM THE MOD**

Hi [Redacted]

No comments from an MOD perspective at this stage.

Thanks,

Regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted] | Sqn Ldr | SO2 Airspace Plans | Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management |  
CAA Aviation House | Gatwick, RH6 0YR | Civilian Telephone: [Redacted] | MOD Net:  
[Redacted] | E-Mail: [Redacted]

**FEEDBACK FROM AUSTRIAN AIRLINES**

Sorry [Redacted],

I hope it is not too late and have sent a copy of our comments now as well to [airspace@heathrow.com](mailto:airspace@heathrow.com).

Thank you and best regards,

■



**Austrian Airlines**

■

AO/PC-A - ATC & airport OPS  
CDR/TRI/TRE/SEN A320

Office Park 2, Postbox 100  
A-1300 Vienna Airport, Austria

■

■

email: ■

**From:** ■

**Sent:** Sonntag, 29. September 2019 14:51

**To:** ■

**Subject:** RE: Slightly Steeper Approaches ACP - Engagement on Comprehensive List of Options - Request for Feedback

H ■

Thanks for the feedback.

Unfortunately I cannot comment on any feedback received for any ACP, however can I ask if you sent your feedback to: as the email below directed?

Kind regards

■

**From:** ■

**Sent:** 27 September 2019 14:13

**To:** ■

**Subject:** RE: Slightly Steeper Approaches ACP - Engagement on Comprehensive List of Options - Request for Feedback

**Caution: external email. Unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe, do not click links or open attachments.**

Good Afternoon ■,

Thank you for forwarding the presentation;  
Generally good, but what is not mentioned concerning RNAV Approaches is that the **vertical guidance** is based on barometric information only with 3 basic effects: generally more exposed to errors, generally less accurate guidance of the desired path, and no guidance at all after the minimum; these are safety related issues. On the quality issue in regard to noise on steeper approaches you should check the need for earlier extension of configuration (/Flap, Slats and gear) and higher

approach configuration (Flap Full instead of Flap3) which results in more **aerodynamic noise** than on standard 3° glidepath; both effects are missing in the presentation.

And finally and in between safety and operational quality the mixed mode operation for **parallel approaches** (ILS with NPA) should be considered at early stages of planning (spacing between runways which are planned to be flown independently).

Thanks and best regards from [REDACTED],

[REDACTED]



**Austrian Airlines**

[REDACTED]

AO/PC-A ATC & airport OPS  
CDR/TRI/TRE/SEN A320

Office Park 2, Postbox 100  
A-1300 Vienna Airport, Austria

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]