

# MINUTES OF DVOR RATIONALISATION – MANCHESTER (MCT) DEPLOYMENT ASSESSMENT MEETING HELD VIA TEAMS MEETING ON 1 DECEMBER 2020

01 December 2020

## Distribution List:

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Present /	Appointment /	Representing
[REDACTED]	Technical Regulator	CAA
[REDACTED]	IFP Regulator	CAA
[REDACTED]	Economic Regulator	CAA
[REDACTED]	Environmental Regulator	CAA
[REDACTED]	Technical Regulator	CAA
[REDACTED]	Principal Airspace Regulator	CAA
[REDACTED]	Manager - ATC Development	NATS
[REDACTED]	Manager – ATC Development	NATS
[REDACTED]	Airspace Change Specialist	NATS
[REDACTED]	Senior Project Manager	NATS

## CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

CAA noted that the agenda and the sponsor presentation slide pack were received in advance of the Assessment Meeting and confirmed that the documents must be published by the sponsor, together with minutes of the meeting, on the Airspace Change portal page. CAA explained the purpose of the meeting and confirmed that the meeting was an Assessment Meeting and not a Gateway. The CAA reinforced that the sponsor was required to provide a broad description of their proposed approach to meeting the CAA's CAP 1616 requirements, but the CAA was not deciding whether the proposed approach met the detailed requirements of the CAA's process at this stage. The purpose of the Assessment Meeting (set out in detail in CAP 1616) was broadly:

- for the Sponsor to present and discuss their Statement of Need,
- to enable the CAA to consider whether the proposal concerned falls within the scope of the formal airspace change process, including determining whether the proposal falls within the scope of a CAP 1616 ACP,
- to enable the CAA to consider the appropriate provisional Level to assign to the change proposal.

Additionally, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to proceed to fulfil the requirements of the airspace change process and to provide information on timescales. Lastly, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to meet the engagement requirements of the various stage of the airspace change process.

	ACTION
<p><b>Item 1 – Introduction</b></p> <p>Introductions made and attendees confirmed.</p> <p>■■■ opened the meeting with the CAA opening statement.</p>	
<p><b>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</b></p> <p>The Statement of Need was presented and reviewed.</p> <p>No comments made; agreed by all as being fit for purpose.</p>	
<p><b>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change</b></p> <p>All procedures identified within the assessment meeting slidepack were presented, It was described that NATS will be seeking to replicate convention procedures with RNAV routes, and to withdraw any unrequired procedures.</p> <p><i>RNAV specification</i> – SR asked if the intention was to replicate conventional routes with RNAV1 or RNAV5 specification.</p> <p>PM described that this is currently being scoped by the Design Team. Where there is necessity for RNAV1 eg IOM sector, then this will be utilised. If there is an opportunity to modernise the airspace, then NATS will seek to implement this.</p> <p><i>Speed Limiting Points</i> – Several procedures require the capturing of Speed Limiting Points (SLP). ■■■ stated that if SLP is 250 below FL100, it may be possible to make STARS more expeditious and can remove waypoints.</p> <p>■■■ commented that where the SLP is on the Hold, this may allow the removal of the SLP.</p>	
<p><b>Item 4 – Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified</b></p> <p><i>RNAV Specification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ■■■ asked if NATS have considered a capability/equipage audit of traffic using the STARS in order to enhance opportunity for RNAV1 specification.</li> <li>- ■■■ informed that NATS have this data and will be utilising it as part of the design process.</li> <li>- ■■■ highlighted the preference would be for RNAV1 however the traffic equipage would need to be determined to ensure efficiencies for flight planning and for controller workload.</li> <li>- ■■■ added that there will definitely need to be provision within the procedures for RNAV5 equipped aircraft.</li> </ul> <p><i>Speed Limiting Points</i> – NATS Design Team to review and apply most efficient means to apply these to replicated routes.</p>	

<p><b>Item 5 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements*</b></p> <p>It is proposed by NATS this is a Level 2C change due to replacing/removing existing airspace structures, and as this will have no effect below 7,000ft.</p> <p>No comments alternative to this.</p> <p><i>* When the sponsor submits their gateway materials for each Gateway at the agreed submission deadline, the period between this and the gateway decision will be an analysis by the CAA Airspace Regulatory team (Airspace Regulation) of the documentation submitted, for the purposes of making a recommendation to the CAA Gateway decision maker(s). In conducting the gateway assessment, the CAA is assessing the process employed and its compliance with the guidance stipulated within CAP1616. It is not an assessment of the merits of the submission itself, which is reviewed at Stage 5 - Decision. We may request, documentation from the sponsor that is referred to in the gateway submission but has not been provided as part of the Gateway submission materials. We may also request the sponsor to provide information by way of clarification relating to statements or assumptions made in the submission. Any further information sought by Airspace Regulation at this stage is for clarificatory purposes and is only for determining compliance with the CAP 1616 process.</i></p> <p><i>Please note that this text does not apply to airspace change proposals involving the sole implementation of GNSS IAPs without an approach control service, as Gateway Assessments are not required. Therefore this text can be removed from the Assessment Meeting minutes.</i></p> <p><i>In any instance where a sponsor has not met the requirements of the process, we will inform them after the gateway decision and advise of next steps.</i></p>																						
<p><b>Item 6 – Provisional process timescales*</b></p> <p>Proposed timelines were discussed, with the requested timescales:</p> <table><thead><tr><th></th><th><b>Gateway</b></th><th><b>Submission</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Stage 1 – Define</td><td>29/01/2021</td><td>15/01/2021</td></tr><tr><td>Stage 2 – Develop</td><td>26/02/2021</td><td>12/02/2021</td></tr><tr><td>Stage 3 – Consult</td><td>26/02/2021</td><td>12/02/2021</td></tr><tr><td>Stage 4 – Update and Submit</td><td>18/03/2021</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Stage 5 – Decide</td><td>03/06/2021</td><td>(11 week decision period)</td></tr><tr><td>Stage 6 – Implement</td><td>AIRAC 09 2021</td><td>(09/09/21)</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>Given that consultation is already completed for the DVOR programme, it is requested that Stage 2 &amp; 3 are multi-gateways. It was agreed this would be acceptable.</p> <p>The CAA cannot currently agree to timescales, given current demands and workloads.</p> <p>■ asked if NATS intended to consult with AIS regarding their capacity when deciding on timelines and priorities.</p> <p>■ thanked the CAA for their support and acknowledged the internal resource demand.</p> <p>■ - Communication between CAA/NATS to help prioritise demand has been ongoing since SoNs submitted.</p> <p>■ indicated we are all working to best endeavours to deliver.</p> <p>■ – acknowledged the intent and drive of the programme to deliver.</p> <p><i>* The timeline agreed may become subject to change by the CAA. This is because the Secretary of State for Transport has directed the CAA to prioritise GNSS applications and this may have an impact on your ACP if we need to direct resource accordingly.</i></p>		<b>Gateway</b>	<b>Submission</b>	Stage 1 – Define	29/01/2021	15/01/2021	Stage 2 – Develop	26/02/2021	12/02/2021	Stage 3 – Consult	26/02/2021	12/02/2021	Stage 4 – Update and Submit	18/03/2021		Stage 5 – Decide	03/06/2021	(11 week decision period)	Stage 6 – Implement	AIRAC 09 2021	(09/09/21)	
	<b>Gateway</b>	<b>Submission</b>																				
Stage 1 – Define	29/01/2021	15/01/2021																				
Stage 2 – Develop	26/02/2021	12/02/2021																				
Stage 3 – Consult	26/02/2021	12/02/2021																				
Stage 4 – Update and Submit	18/03/2021																					
Stage 5 – Decide	03/06/2021	(11 week decision period)																				
Stage 6 – Implement	AIRAC 09 2021	(09/09/21)																				

<p><b>Item 7 – Next steps</b></p> <p>Once resources permit, timescales will be agreed and uploaded to the portal.  Assessment meeting slides and agenda to be uploaded to portal.  Meeting minutes to be circulated, agreed and uploaded to portal (redacted version).</p>	
<p><b>Item 8 – Any other business</b></p> <p>■ – made general observations for DVOR submissions that they should capture all engagement with airports, in order to fully justify any proposals.  Also a reminder that non-technical language should be used in ACP documentation order to meet the target audience.</p>	

**ACTIONS ARISING FROM DVOR RATIONALISATION (MANCHESTER) ASSESSMENT MEETING**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Timescales	■	To confirm timescales as requested/revised	

NATS  
ACP Sponsor