Lead Operator Carrier Panel Review #14

Web Conference

Date 1st – 2nd December 2020

Attendees

Aer Lingus [redacted]
Airbus [redacted]
Boeing [redacted]
Boeing [redacted]
CAA [redacted]
CAA [redacted]
CAA [redacted]
CAA [redacted]
Delta [redacted]
easyJet [redacted]
easyJet [redacted] *[Day 2]*
Flybe [redacted] *[Day 1]*
GE [redacted]
GE [redacted] *[Day 1]*
GE [redacted]
GE [redacted]
GE [redacted]
Jeppesen [redacted]
Jet2 [redacted] *[Day 2]*
Lufthansa [redacted] *[Day 2]*
Lufthansa Systems [redacted]
NATS [redacted]

NATS [redacted]
NATS
NATS
NATS
NATS
NATS
NATS
NATS
NATS
NATS
NATS
NATS
NATS
NATS
NATS
Qatar Airways
Ryanair
Ryanair
United Airlines
United Airlines
United Airlines
Virgin Atlantic

Agenda

	DAY 1	
13:00	Welcome & Introductions	
13:10	Review of format and participation going forward	[redacted]
13:20	Review of Actions	
13:30	Follow up from the Technical Group	Technical Group Co-chairs
14:00	PBN Policy and Regulatory Developments	[redacted]
	Airline requirements of airspace	
15:30	*Meeting End*	
	DAY 2	
13:00	RP3 Airspace Plan Review	[redacted]
	Design Workshop Output	
	SAIP AD6	
	Free Route Airspace Deployment 1	
	Trajectory Data Sharing	
14:45	AoB	
15:00	*Meeting End*	-

Refer to "Lead Operator Carrier Panel #14 - SLIDE PACK v1.1"

DAY 1

[redacted]

Review of Actions

The Actions reviewed at the meeting are captured in the following table:

#	ACTION	Owner	Status
[redacted]			

* https://www.customer.nats.co.uk/fas/airspace-change/pbn-research-project/

The Actions raised at the meeting are captured in the following table:

#	ACTION	Owner	Status
[redacted]			
Action102	Provide a summary of the FRA Deployment 1 changes that can be shared around the airlines.	[redacted]	**CLOSED** – Sent out with the meeting minutes

Follow Up from the Technical Group – [redacted] (NATS) & [redacted] (Flybe)

As there was no Technical Group Face-to-Face meeting, the activities of the group were summarised for the Carrier Panel.

There were 6 topics with progress updates since the December 2019 meeting. All have essentially been completed barring two outstanding actions.

[redacted]

The topics closed at this meeting are:

1) Free Route and 5LNC
2) [redacted]
3) Free Route Airspace Connecting Points
4) [redacted]
5)

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

- [redacted]
- [redacted]
- [redacted]
- [redacted]
- [redacted]

DAY 2

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Free Route Airspace Deployment 1 – [redacted] (NATS)

Removes all flight plannable routes from circa 1/3 of UK airspace, applicable at FL255+ in airspace within the domain of the NATS Prestwick ACC.

Preliminary figures from analysis using data from the Eurocontrol Network Manager FRA modelling system, based on traffic from 11th July 2019 (1,652 flights) shows reduction of:

- ✓ 2,664nm,
- ✓ 1,832 mins flight time,
- ✓ 113,756 kg fuel burn
- ✓ 359,490kg CO_2.

These benefits are based on the assumption that operators will make use of the new FRA in their flight planning.

Due to a lack of radar coverage in far NW boundary of the Scottish FIR, routes there will be controlled by the RAD. This is also the case in the far North Sea boundary with Denmark; here, some airspace has been delegated to Denmark and routes will be controlled by the RAD.

[1] [redacted]

NATS had hoped to use Space-based ADS-B to fill coverage gaps; however, this solution is not possible to integrate into existing systems. When technology program allows new systems to be introduced then RAD restrictions will be removed.

Flight plan analysis with the Network Manager and Jeppesen is allowing NATS to model the flight interactions within FRA.

Flight Plan Buffer Zones (FBZs) will be added around Danger Areas in FRA. The filing of intermediate waypoints is required to avoid FBZs where otherwise the corner would be cut. There will also be 3 No Planning Zones (NPZs) to prevent flight planning too close to the Oceanic boundary

There have been issues around the use of 3LNC (for VORs) versus 5LNC (for FRA connecting points); this was raised at the Lead Operator Technical Group. Following detailed discussions with both the EU NM and adjacent States it was identified that only two 3LNC produce an issue for Eurocontrol's IFPS and trajectory management systems. SUM and BEL are duplicated with Sweden (SUM) and Denmark (BEL), as a result all 3 States agreed that neither would publish BEL or SUM within FRA and where required for lower route connectivity 3LNC would be replaced by 5LNC alternatives. In examination, neither SUM nor BEL, in the UK, have any SIDs or STARs associated with them, so NATS proposes that these could be replaced with 5LNC for FRA operations: BEL replaced with BELZU and SUM replaced with WAFIL. The SUM and BEL VORs would remain in operation for exceptions (non-GNSS RNAV 5 aircraft); however, neither point would be available for flight plan use. This has been communicated to the CAA Technical Regulator.[3]

Airlines highlighted that there are flight planning limitations with FRA. *Does NATS envisage a FRA with no waypoints or an infinite number of potential waypoints to allow for more efficient flight planning?* Potentially, in the future, it may be possible to simply file lat/lngs in FRA, as is done today within Oceanic airspace, but reporting points are still expected to be require for foreseeable future to allow coordination within the flight planning system.

It was requested that the FRA slides to be provided separately so that they may be shared with other departments within the airlines.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[3] This topic is still the subject of ongoing discussions between NATS, CAA and EUROCONTROL.