

Daventry DVOR Removal ACP – Stage 2

Additional Document for CAA Use Only: Not for Publication

Stakeholder Evidence for Stage 2 – as summarised in Annex H of Stage 2 Documentation.

1. Email exchange with Birmingham Airport including minutes of meeting held 18/12/19

From: [REDACTED] N
Sent: 23 December 2019 10:16
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: DVOR removal - meeting notes

Hi [REDACTED]

Great to see you last Wednesday and many thank for affording me your time. As promised, based on my original 'agenda' please see below my notes and memories from our discussion.

1. Removal of the WCO 2Y SID:
 - Either remove it – who would need to do ACP/Consultation? Do you actually need it given there is no WCO SID from runway 33 anymore? or
 - Re-designate it as WEZKO 1M – implications for EFPS costs/timings

I explained the two options and, notwithstanding data from your NTK your preference would be to remove it as you removed the WCO from runway 33. Kirstin advised she would get some data and I confirmed that we would put flight planning options in place in order that traffic could still flight plan to points within the London TMA and south-east in most cases utilising the DTY 2Y SID. The other option would require new software builds for EFPS and it was felt not justified for the relatively few flights that use that SID but it does remain an alternative option if BAL don't wish to/can't remove the WCO. It would require an ACP – probably by BAL as they own the SID. Another alternative may be to simply block the use of the WCO 2Y by putting in other flight planning options and making those mandatory for traffic reasons – in most cases these would be closer to the tactical route flown/given and in any case the tactical route flown given could remain unchanged regardless of the flight planned route. Whilst it would like be a Level 1 ACP it probably won't require the level of consultation your 2Y SIDs required. In terms of timescales we would like to remove the NDB as soon as possible after the en-route dependency is lifted which is planned for 10 Sep 2020. Given the amount of work the CAA has and once you confirm you wish to proceed in this manner it may be best to submit the SoN as soon as you can.
1. Use of OLIVE:
 - The WCO/BNN deployment will remove the OLIVE 3A STAR but retain the OLIVE 1B (in case the DTY deployment doesn't happen coincidentally)
 - The DTY deployment will remove the OLIVE 1B and RNAV the CHASE Hold
 - Once these are complete the OLIVE Procedures can be removed

I briefed you on the fact that the WCO/BNN Removal ACP would remove the OLIVE 1B STAR and that the DTY removal ACP would remove all the OLIVE STARS because it would remove the dependency on

CHASE from HON. You asked if this could happen as soon as possible however I advised that whilst we had targeted May 2020 due to CAA resource the target date is now September 2020. From your perspective if we had to prioritise one over the other you would like us to prioritise DTY so that you can remove OLIVE procedures.

3. RNAVing and re-designation of CHASE STARs

- The STARs from the northwest will be RNAV's because the 2D & 1C are dependent on DTY
- However this will result in 4 STARs from the north-west to ensure we capture all Descent Planning levels and flight planning options – will explain on Wednesday
- Would you prefer the STARs via MCT re-designated as per ICAO (they will remain Conventional until we do MCT DVOR)? I have asked PC the same question – awaiting a response

I briefed you on the plans for 4 STARs from the north and this causes you no issue and you also have no issue if the CHASE STARs via MCT stay designated as they are now or take on the ICAO designation

4. 2Y SID Truncations

- Unfortunately we have run out of time to truncate them in RP2 and there is currently no funding available for anymore SID Truncations
- Do you plan to truncate anyway as part of FASI-S/LAMP?
- If so, at the same point?
- Would you wish to combine the truncated COWLY/CPT as one SID?

I briefed you on the fact that the SID Truncation programme at least as part of our 10% project has now ended and that we couldn't complete the truncation of the 2Y SIDs in time. We discussed the original plan to truncate back to the 6000ft point but that you advised you still have some issues with SIDs ending at different points depending on the runway in use. We also discussed the viability of having just one southbound SID from runway 15 and that if this was the case it would be better to be the truncated COWLY 2Y. the distance between the two truncated points is 1.8nm putting a new SID would be a bigger ACP than removing one of them (the CPT 2Y) but it would move more traffic over the people who live under the COWLY 2Y. It would also extend the track mileage for traffic routeing via CPT by 0.6nm.

We discussed the viability of truncating the COWLY 2Y at waypoint EMKUK and extending the ADMEX SID to EMKUK. This would be a truncation of 24.2nm for the COWLY 2Y SID (and potentially the CPT 2Y SID) departures but an extension of 23.4nm for the ADMEX departures but at least it would resolve the routeing query issue and remove the possibility of an wrong turn by aircraft. I advised that I would obtain analysis to see the impact on AOs of making this change. Longer term if the UK were to adopt Departure Transitions we could truncate back to APROD (BBE17) and ADMEX and then have EKUK Transitions perhaps with a vertical element in it too.

5. Areas of DTY/EGBB CTA where the base could be raised ?

We discussed this briefly but the desire to do this has been slightly dented by the new DfT rulings of taking/giving CAS and its probably best to wait to include it as part of FASI-S

6. UMLUX SID issue – potential solutions: We discussed the two options below as well as two additional options:

i. Amend SID level at UMLUX to FL80

i. Whilst this in theory would be the easiest solution and could be done by use of a radar/NTK data as evidence for what would hopefully be a straightforward albeit Level 1 ACP it does cause Birmingham ATC a potential problem descending CHASE arrivals below FL90 when ever there was an UMLUX departure. [Post](#)

meeting: whilst I totally recognise and appreciate the issue thought must also be given the limited availability of the route and the actual number of UMLUX departures and balance this against the viability of the other options. If there was a continuous stream of UMLUX departures and CHASE arrivals I would agree this option is not viable but given the number of UMLUX departures will there always be a CHASE arrival to conflict or could this option actually be manageable?

- ii. Lower base of N92 between UMLUX and LUXTO
 - i. This is possible but would require further CAS and below 7000ft so would likely be a Level 1 ACP and arguably less straightforward than the previous option and, given the current DfT requirements for 'call-in' on new CAS I question whether NATS would have the appetite for this level of change for such a low amount of traffic.
 - iii. Another option we discussed was to add a new waypoint maybe 5nm before UMLUX and make that the 6000ft point and redesignate the SID accordingly – again this would likely be a Level 1 ACP but based on the evidence provided by radar/NTK data hopefully not too arduous in terms of consultation – it would require some IFP work but again hopefully not too arduous and shouldn't impact thrust setting/noise levels over and above what is experienced today.
 - iv. The final option would be to 'simply' (?) move UMLUX 1/2/3 nm north-east along the track of the SID and terminate the SID there? I think when we originally considered the location of UMLUX we thought it would be best to have on L151 to facilitate a left turn to CPT however that idea seems to have been abandoned but hence we were left with UMLUX where it is. Normally CAA and ICAO won't allow you to move a waypoint insisting on 6 months before the point used again. However in this case we could put forward a reasons argument why it would have no impact on simply moving UMLUX and ask for the CAA/ICAO to approve it based on our rationale. Even if an aircraft were to route to the 'old' UMLUX that would be ok as it would pass through the 'new' UMLUX – these days, the chances of data not being updated (aside from maybe the first day or so following a change) is less likely than it would have been a few years ago. If UMLUX was moving such that it may cause a lateral change in track then that could be more of an issue
- **Post meeting:** I think the best option but not necessarily the easiest would be Option iv – it meets your requirements, meets our requirements and with a pragmatic view from CAA/ICAO could be relatively easy. Failing that I still think Option (i) is good and should be manageable at least in the short to medium term - if in the longer term it is envisaged to obtain the airspace H24 and encourage/mandate AOs to use it then it could be an issue but given the uptake thus far I think that is many years away!

7. AOB
None

Thanks again for giving up your time and for [REDACTED] coming all the way over – look forward to discussing more in 2020.

Have a great Christmas and New Year!

Cheers
[REDACTED]

2. Email exchange with Stansted Airport confirming no issue with proposed changes

Morning [REDACTED]

The airport have indicated they are happy that I can respond on their behalf as long as there is no impact on SS operations that would affect the ACPs already in progress.

Given the recent conversations please go ahead.

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

GM ATS Stansted

D: [REDACTED]
M: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]

Stansted Airport
Control Tower Building
Bassingbourn Road
Stansted Essex
CM24 1AH
www.nats.co.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 November 2019 11:52
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Re-designation of the LOREL 5A, 1B & 2L STARs - response required

Hi [REDACTED]

As part of the DTY DVOR removal (also planned for September 2020) we plan to truncate the LOREL 1K STAR from DTY and truncate it at FINMA to become a FINMA 1L: this STAR essentially is for low level positioning flights from EGNX but given that since it was established back when Moses was parting the Nile ATS Route M605 now exists between DTY & FINMA so it makes sense to use the route to get to FINMA. Longer term, the STARs via CLIPY will be realigned to also start at/.route via FINMA.

All being well this change will coincide with the rationalising of the 3 STARs under the WCO/BNN deployment briefed and agreed below however there is the possibility they may not. Consequently could you please confirm that you and Stansted Airport have no objection to the truncation of the LOREL 1K becoming a FINMA 1L. I confirm this will not alter any tracks over the ground below 7000ft (or at any level) from is flown today and will not lead to any flight planning/FMS issues.

Cheers

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 November 2019 11:43
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Re-designation of the LOREL 5A, 1B & 2L STARs - response required

Perfect, I will pass that back to ensure they have clarity.

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
GM ATS Stansted

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 November 2019 09:22
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Re-designation of the LOREL 5A, 1B & 2L STARs - response required

Thanks [REDACTED]

I can see why the question is being asked however it is totally different to SIDs as the STAR will form part of the flight plan and is NOT dependent on the runway in use – there are only a few STARs in the UK that are runway dependent and yours are not (they could well be in the future – who knows!). Even if they were, the method of selection in the FMS is far more obvious and straightforward to flight crews as this happens around the world all day every day.

So in summary, truncating and combining these three little used STARs into one slightly more used STAR will have no impact on TC or Stansted operations.

Cheers

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Swanwick Development ATCO

D: [REDACTED]
M: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 November 2019 08:49
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Re-designation of the LOREL 5A, 1B & 2L STARs - response required

Morning [REDACTED]

Sorry its taken a while to get back to you. Attached is the response from STA. However there was a further conversation which needed more work...

“The only thing I’d add to this (which sort of aligns with [REDACTED] point) is around the truncation element. There’s been some issues where SIDs have been truncated and how the waypoints are then interpreted in the FMS. The impact has generally been felt following runway change and has resulted in aircraft getting to the truncation point and then getting “confused”. In the absence of any other information its then been defaulting to its previous knowledge, which has been a SID waypoint for the original runway.

It’s a known issue and has currently only been seen on SIDs but I’m guessing there’s a risk on STARs as well. NATS are addressing with the coding houses but as you say [REDACTED], we wouldn’t want this to impact our operation even if an aircraft on the STAR is still under control of TC.”

I don’t see this as a barrier as we (NATS) are not responsible for the coding houses and have procedures for dealing with aircraft who do not follow the correct profile when they are identified.

Let me know if this is all acceptable and a date when you expect to transition so I can pass that back.

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

GM ATS Stansted

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 October 2019 15:58
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re-designation of the LOREL 5A, 1B & 2L STARs - response required

Hi [REDACTED]

I hope you’re well.

We are now looking at the removal of the en-route dependency from WCO/BNN currently planned for September 2020 and as a result we need to RNAV your LOREL 5A, 1B & 2L STARs.

Can you please confirm that you have no issue with us firstly truncating and realigning these to become one STAR commencing at waypoint SILVA (just next to WCO) and redesignating it as a SILVA 1L?

This will just leave your STARs from the north to be RNAV’d which we hope to complete by the end of 2020.

Have you made any progress or made any decisions on removing the aerodrome dependency from the DVORs targeted for removal?

All the best

[REDACTED]

3. Email exchange with Luton Airport confirming no issue with proposed changes

No that's perfect thanks.

I wanted to understand if you are open to changing it as part of FASI-S and it seems that there is potential to do so, that is ok.

I am happy to approve this if [REDACTED] is of the same opinion? Please can I also ask that we are kept updated with this.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Airspace and Noise Performance Manager
London Luton Airport
Navigation House
Airport Way, Luton
Bedfordshire LU2 9LY

E [REDACTED]
W london-luton.co.uk

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 11 November 2019 16:10

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: LOREL 1K STAR

Hi [REDACTED]

You're welcome.

In short, we don't currently know. Luton's airspace and routes will form part of a future iteration of FASI-S, alongside appropriate adjacent airports, however the details are not currently known. It doesn't necessarily mean that changes have to occur; but that will be worked out between all relevant stakeholders including Luton and NATS.

The first iteration of FASI-S will focus on the airspace surrounding Bristol, Cardiff and Exeter; the designs for this are not currently known.

Apologies for not being able to provide any more information at the moment.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 11 November 2019 15:47

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: LOREL 1K STAR

Thanks both.

I just have one more question if I may – is this likely to change again under FASI-S? Its only because our arrival routings are likely to have to go further north, and therefore if this is unlikely to be reviewed again in FASI-S I would need to discuss a bit more about the implications of this.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Airspace and Noise Performance Manager
London Luton Airport
Navigation House
Airport Way, Luton
Bedfordshire LU2 9LY

E [REDACTED]
w london-luton.co.uk

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 08 November 2019 09:58

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: LOREL 1K STAR

Hi [REDACTED]

Just to point out that I'll be submitting the ACP for the WCO/ BNN work package on the 29th November (3 weeks today).

It will be publicly available after this date via the link [REDACTED] sent you below.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

NATS

[REDACTED]

Airspace Change Specialist

D: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]
Mailbox 11, C2-18
4000 Parkway, Whiteley,
Fareham, Hants PO15 7FL
www.nats.co.uk



NATS PRIVATE

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 08 November 2019 09:48

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: LOREL 1K STAR

Hi [REDACTED]

Please find links as requested

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

DTY

<https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?pID=181>

WCO/BNN

<https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?pID=118>

NATS

[REDACTED]

Airspace Change Proposal Specialist
Airspace Change Assurance

D: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]

4000 Parkway, Whiteley,
Fareham, Hants PO15 7FL
www.nats.co.uk



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 November 2019 22:49
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: LOREL 1K STAR

Hi [REDACTED]

None of the changes we have done of will do will have any impact on capacity at Luton (or any other airport for that matter).

[REDACTED] I'm on leave could you please provide [REDACTED] with them links to WCO/BNN and DTY DVOR removal ACPs?

Cheers
[REDACTED]

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2019 8:26:15 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: LOREL 1K STAR

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for this.

Please can you let me know if you expect this change to have any impact on capacity at Luton? Also, please can you send me the CAA portal links to this ACP and the one we discussed last week?

Thanks.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Airspace and Noise Performance Manager
London Luton Airport
Navigation House
Airport Way, Luton
Bedfordshire LU2 9LY

E [REDACTED]
W london-luton.co.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 November 2019 11:58
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: LOREL 1K STAR

Hi [REDACTED]

Thank you for your time on the phone last week and good to see you at the Airport Connectivity Workshop on Monday – as you could tell from my voice I wasn't in the best place to chat!!

In addition to the rationalisation of the 3 LOREL STARS we are doing under the WCO//BNN DVOR removal that we chatted about last week, as part of the DTY DVOR removal (also planned for September 2020) we plan to truncate the LOREL 1K STAR from DTY and truncate it at FINMA to become a FINMA 1L: this STAR essentially is for low level positioning flights from EGNX but given that since it was established ATS Route M605 now exists between DTY & FINMA so it makes sense to use the Route to get to FINMA. Longer term, the STARS via CLIPY will be realigned to also start at/.route via FINMA or perhaps elsewhere as part of AD6. The AD6 have been engaged re the truncation at FINMA and confirm they are supportive of the change and that it will not impact their design work.

East Midlands Airport
Castle Donington
DE74 2SA

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 24 January 2020 16:24

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Notes from EGNX meeting 18/12/19

Thanks [REDACTED]

Have you seen my subsequent email advising that the NATS design team can now find a way to utilise the current PIGOT Hold and not require any EFPS changes? And likewise no PPR!

All your comments noted re the SIDs and that thus will remain within the context of FASI-S/FASI-N.

However there is a requirement to remove the NERL dependencies from DTY by the end of 2020 and therefore the plan is to RNAV the two STARs into PIGOT and the PIGOT Hold.

Thoughts welcome

Cheers

[REDACTED]

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, January 24, 2020 4:16:06 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Notes from EGNX meeting 18/12/19

Hi [REDACTED]

I have read through your notes and would like to make the following change:

In the first section you can remove the following line -

normally at CTC which historically has been expensive and as well time consuming having to travel to Hampshire.

Testing is done with the NAS team, but remotely at EMA. There is however a cost implication to this, which I believe is usually around [REDACTED]. We will also have to pay our EFPS supplier for the update which hasn't been budgeted for in the FY.

I also have some comments to add to the general meeting notes:

This was the first time that EMA had been formally approached about the RNAVing of the hold at PIGOT. You explained that your ambition was to have this completed by September this year, but I don't believe that this is a realistic option given the changes that need to be made and the fact that we hadn't planned any of this work. Our ACP timelines have been clearly stated at both FASI-N and FASI-S meetings and I have always stated that we were only ever looking to make one set of changes.

After the meeting I thought about the proposed changes at PIGOT and I have some concerns. I believe that there is a potential redistribution of traffic here once they come out of the hold and so we would need to look closely at whether that constituted a PPR of traffic and see what the CAA's view on this would be.

I am also concerned about the DTY SID truncation as I have had previous discussions about this with NERL and it was agreed that we would do this as and when we go through our ACP. Once again, any changes here will require amendments to our EFPS and testing. I also feel it unwise to change at this stage as we are just going through our stage 2 of CAP1616 and don't want to be seen to be pre-determining where the SID will be.

The BPK SID will be looked at as part of our ACP and our customers requirements will be taken into account as to what types of routings they would like to see out of EMA.

I believe that further dialogue is required between NERL and EMA to decide on a way forwards with this as I don't believe that full consideration has been given to the practical and costly implications of these planned changes.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Air Traffic Services Manager
East Midlands Airport
Castle Donington
DE74 2SA

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 January 2020 15:32

To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Notes from EGNX meeting 18/12/19

Hi [REDACTED]

In order to satisfy the CAP1616 process can you please confirm that the notes below are an accurate record of our discussion on 18/12/19?

Many thanks
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 December 2019 12:32
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Notes from EGNX meeting 18/12/19

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks again for finding time in your calendar to meet me – I think it was a very useful discussion and please see below my record of the conversation as well as some updates since I got back yesterday.

1. RNAVing of the PIGOT STARs in support of DTY DVOR removal and the issue with replicating the PIGOT hold and using UPDUK:

- Essentially it's not possible to replicate the PIGOT Hold and use UPDUK as the entry

I briefed you on the issue of RNAVing the PIGOT Hold and, when using RNAV design criteria, only having one waypoint in the hold for Coding purposes and that as it was not possible to use UPDUK to get to PIGOT using RNAV design criteria therefore, to replicate the current hold it would have to become an UPDUK Hold and waypoint PIGOT would disappear. You asked whether we could retain PIGOT but have a right hand hold but at PIGOT and remove UPDUK? I said that whilst that may well be possible it would fall outside of the scope of the project which is essentially replication and whilst we have tweaked some other STARs very slightly to reflect where the aircraft fly laterally changing the actual direction of a published hold may be stretching it slightly!! Certainly if it is something that you think would be operationally beneficial going forward post LAMP then by all means raise it as part of your plans.

You advised that amending the name of the hold to UPDUK would cause you to amend EFPS and illustrated the issue by taking me into the Approach Radar room where it was clear what the issue would be. You advised that because

you have to tie up your EFPS functionality with NAS that it not only requires software changes but that this requires **thorough** testing – normally at CTC which historically has been expensive and as well time consuming having to travel to Hampshire. I advised that I would make enquiries at NATS as to whether these costs could be covered by the Project and also potentially consider truncating the DTY SIDs at SAPCO as part of the change as this also requires EFPS changes/testing and so wrap the changes and testing in one go.

Post meeting: Thank you for advising the name of the NATS contact for this work – we now have a meeting set up in early January to discuss further. I have also engaged our Procedure Design people and explained the issue to them and they are going to look at finding a way into PIGOT (left hand) by using another (new) waypoint if possible – if this is viable we would then compare the re-design costs with the testing costs and proceed accordingly however I suspect your preference would be to retain PIGOT – UPDUK would, I'm afraid, have to be removed and returned to ICARD. One thing I did forget to advise you is that there would need to be new waypoint on the RNAV version of the STARs – this waypoint will be used to denote the SLP and be between VELAG and UPDUK (or the new point) and at the moment we have MIHAK reserved for it. I will keep you updated on the progress of discussions here but my hunch at the moment is that removing UPDUK and retaining PIGOT will be the better option.

- At the moment we are designing an UPDUK Hold which replicates the track over the ground of the PIGOT Hold but this will then provide a DISCO with your 'without radar control' procedures'

I pointed out the potential issue if we have to rename the hold at UPDUK and that unless your 'without radar control' procedures were not amended it would create a theoretical DISCO and that therefore the CAA would be unlikely to approve the change. To resolve this issue the without radar control procedures would need to be amended to read *"After crossing PIGOT At UPDUK turn left onto track 331° 344° to intercept DTY VOR R006. After DTY D25 descend to cross DTY D28 ALT at which to leave; FL80 via PIGOT not below FL70, DTY D33 not below 5000, DTY D36 at 4000. At DTY D38 turn left to establish on the FAT/LOC descending to not below 2000. Once established continue as for main procedure"*. You advise that this wouldn't be an issue as the procedure is very rarely flown as published and I also confirmed that the change would still be above 7000ft and hence would not trigger a Level 1 change and that RNAVing these procedures in total falls outside the scope of this phase of the project.

Post meeting: of course if we are able to retain PIGOT and the PIGOT Hold then this chart/procedure will not need amending.

1. You mentioned you would like to establish runway dependent STARs – Potential issues here are:
 - The sector issuing the STAR won't necessarily know the runway in use
 - What would be the Clearance Limit? The CAA in accordance with CAP493 (Mats Pt.1) require a Clearance Limit to be issued

- This is not the way the UK applies STARs (ie not in accordance with ICAO) –
 - i. albeit Bristol have STARs to runway ends but these are requested by the flight crew much nearer to the airport
 - ii. Newcastle also have 'STARs' from a point to each runway end but again they are not issued by the ACC – they issue a STAR that ends at the IAF (not the FAF for a given runway)

You clarified that what you are proposing is two STARs both ending at PIGOT (UPDUK) and therefore having the same clearance limit but that the identifier of the STAR would change depending on the runway in use and that this has been the request of some of your operators. I explained that this could be due to the fact that it probably happens elsewhere in the world where STARs are more aligned to the ICAO definition – ie in effect transitions. STARs in the UK are slightly different in that they end (not begin) at IAF. Whilst it would be feasible it would need CAA approval and the justification would be quite weak given that no other airport in the UK has this. Additionally, it would need the runway in use (and change thereof) to be promulgated and accessible by each of the en-route sectors to issue to the flight crews on entry into the UK FIR. I am not sure if this is feasible as a few years ago now we removed the runway information for major airports when issuing STARs and so this may be interpreted as retrograde step – we now rely on flight crews picking up the ATIS for to confirm the runway in use. The example I gave above of Bristol is slightly different in that whilst they have established RNAV STARs to each runway end these are 'on request' and not normally issued by the ACC (Sector 6 in this case) as, again Sector 6 will not necessarily know the runway in use at Bristol.

Post meeting: I will raise this, however in the short term I don't see this changing as it will require system updates and ATC procedures not to mention yet another ACP to establish the other STAR and may also try and set a precedent that the CAA don't want to do.

3. Have you considered Point merge? Could work very well for runway 27, potential issues with runway 09 re EGBB LUVUM departures – could change in PLAS re-design?

You advised that it had been considered but that for numerous reasons it has currently been discounted.

4. Have you considered a DTY SID Truncation to SAPCO? This could be done (by us or you) under the SID truncation Process – fuel savings for AOs – potential shorter routeings from SAPCO with more fuel savings – potential use of N92

We discussed this as part of the EFPS issue above – if it is something we can do as part of this project and you support the change it is certainly something we would consider but this element would be done under a separate Statement of Need and in line with the CAA SID Truncation Process.

Post meeting: I will update you following our meeting with [REDACTED] in January

5. Do you use/require the BPK SID?

You confirmed that one aircraft had used it this year! I confirmed that whilst one aircraft had flight planned it and not used it another (probably the same one) had not filed it but was issued it! You indicated that your AOs had indicated a preference to have a SID in that direction (even if only available at night). In the short term it seems silly to remove it but in the longer term and potentially part of LAMP you may wish to truncate it as well as develop other SID design options – it will need to be RNAV'd (or removed or truncated) as part of the DVOR removal work as BPK is one of the DVORs scheduled to be removed.

6. Areas of DTY/EGNX CTA where the base could be raised ?

You are aware of this but also the potential need for new additional CAS and that the current Transport Minister has directed that any more CAS will be called in by the DfT

7. AOB

None



[REDACTED]
Swanwick Development ATCO

D: [REDACTED]
M: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]

5. Email exchange with Liverpool Airport

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 May 2020 12:47
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: DTY DVOR

Hello [REDACTED]

I hope this finds you safe and well and coping with these difficult times.

Just to update you on where we are with the WCO NDB; we have not been able to progress the renaming of it to WEZKO nor its removal and decommissioning as originally was hoped and so it will remain functioning as called WCO at least for this year and probably most of next year.

However, we are progressing the removal of the en-route dependency on the DTY DVOR and as such the entry in GEN2.5 and ENR4.1 will be amended. As you do have procedures that refer to it in the AIP it should be included in your AD2.19 table and therefore we propose to add it into yours along with other aerodrome's AD2.19 sections.

Please see below the draft amendment to your section of the AIP which, with your approval (and approved by the CAA) I will submit to AIS on your behalf. The planned implementation date is 10th September 2020 with AIS deadline of 12th June 2020.

EGTC

AD 2.EGTC-6

Add the following rows to the table in AD2.19

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|---------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| VOR/DME 0.57°W (2019) 0.90°W (2016) | DTY | 116.400 MHz 111X | H24 | 521049N 0010650W | 600 FT | VOR/DME DOC: 60 NM/50000 FT (75 NM/ 50000 FT in Sector R286-346). |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|---------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The DVOR will remain serviceable for aerodrome use but may we respectfully remind you of NATS' intention to withdraw it from service and our letter providing notice to users to remove their dependency from it by 31/12/2022.

FYI I am approved by the CAA and AIS to amend your section of the AIP with your approval of the change and hence I look forward to receiving your agreement to this change in due course.

Kind regards

[Redacted signature]

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 13 May 2020 12:57

To: [Redacted]

Cc: [Redacted]

[Redacted]

Subject: RE: DTY DVOR

Hi [Redacted]

Absolutely you can amend the below on our behalf, and thank you for doing so.

Thanks also for the reminder about the end of service date, we have recently started working on inbound and outbound routes to Cranfield due to the potential airspace change for Stansted and Luton, so I will make sure this is picked up as part of that.

