

Archive: 11 February 2021 14:14:21
Subject: 20200715-ACP 2020 24 E7 limited engagement justification
Sensitivity: Normal

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 July 2020 17:58
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: 20200715-ACP 2020 24 E7 limited engagement justification

Good afternoon [REDACTED],

Following the assessment meeting for E-7 Wedgetail Airborne Early Warning Mk 1 Orbit Areas Change (ACP 2020-24).

The MOD would like the CAA to confirm that they are content that the MOD intend on running limited engagement for Stage 1 and 2 and only involve NATS as the only stakeholder. We believe that this is proportionate due to the following reasons:

- It is a working assumption that the proposed orbit areas will not be segregated;
 - The defined areas will allow interaction on the NATS equipment to ensure controllers are alerted to a potential confliction;
 - Confliction resolution will be tactically managed against the specific aircraft, not the airspace;
 - The airspace will define the scope of the area where the E7 has non-deviating status, which is similar to how the current E3 orbit areas.
- Due to the levels required for orbit, the areas will be fully contained in Class C;
- Through engagement and negotiation, we believe that NATS are likely to influence the location of the orbit areas, hopefully this process will naturally mean that NATS will be able to provide some kind of indication on potential impact on airlines;
- If there are any activation protocols to be worked through, input may be requested from the NATS/MOD joint and integrated Airspace Management Cell.

If, during the course of engagement with NATS, it becomes clear another stakeholder comment is required (for example, due to proximity to international FIR boundaries), then the MOD will inform the CAA and engage with specific stakeholders over specific issues.

Due to the above reasons, the MOD believe the following:

- The GA community have no vested interest (levels, controlled airspace);
- The Airlines should not be considered as stakeholders for engagement purposes (not segregated airspace).
- This will be of no interest to any Aerodromes (levels, controlled airspace).

However, at Stage 3, the MOD will reassess the requirement to consult with the Airlines. This will depend on proposed locations of orbit areas and an assessment, in conjunction with NATS/NM, of the potential impact. The MOD will, at the appropriate time, seek reassurance from the CAA that the proposed consultation strategy will be accepted.

If you have any comments or questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | SO2 Airspace Operations | Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management
CAA, Aviation House | Gatwick Airport South | Crawley | RH6 0YR | Civilian Telephone: [REDACTED] | E-Mail: [REDACTED]

Before Printing consider the environment. This e-mail and any attachment(s) are for authorised use by the intended recipient(s) only. It may contain proprietary material, confidential information and/or be subject to legal privilege. If you are not an intended recipient then please promptly delete this e-mail, as well as any associated attachment(s) and inform the sender. It should not be copied, disclosed to, retained or used by, any other party. Thank you. We cannot accept any liability for any loss or damage sustained as a result of software viruses. You must carry out such virus checking as is necessary before opening any attachment to this message. Please note that all e-mail messages sent to the Civil Aviation Authority are subject to monitoring / interception for lawful business.

Archived: 11 February 2021 14:14:26

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Mon, 20 Jul 2020 14:27:23

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: 20200715-ACP 2020 24 E7 limited engagement justification

Sensitivity: Normal

Dear [REDACTED]

I am pleased to confirm that the CAA has accepted the rationale to proceed with a limited engagement strategy for ACP-2020-24 as described in your email below.

Please note that the Airspace Regulator (Engagement & Consultation) has requested that you include the rationale for the targeted engagement approach in the Stage 1 and Stage 2 submissions, along with the recognition that as you negotiate areas with NATS, if airline impacts are identified, you will engage directly with those stakeholders.

Kind regards

Jenny

[REDACTED]
Airspace Change Account Manager
Airspace, ATM & Aerodromes
Civil Aviation Authority



Tel: [REDACTED]

Follow us on Twitter: [@UK_CAA](#)

Please consider the environment. Think before printing this email.

Due to the Covid-19 outbreak and in line with Government guidance, our staff are working from home and our offices are not currently open to walk-in visitors.

You can help us through this unprecedented time by not communicating with us via traditional post as far as possible. Instead, please email us and do not contact us by post until further notice. If you send any documents by post rather than by email, please also send copies of the relevant documents by email at the same time.

Note that all documents should be sent to us electronically.

Please see our [guidance relating to COVID-19](#) for more information.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 15 July 2020 17:58

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: 20200715-ACP 2020 24 E7 limited engagement justification

Good afternoon [REDACTED],

Following the assessment meeting for E-7 Wedgetail Airborne Early Warning Mk 1 Orbit Areas Change (ACP 2020-24).

The MOD would like the CAA to confirm that they are content that the MOD intend on running limited engagement for Stage 1 and 2 and only involve NATS as the only stakeholder. We believe that this is proportionate due to the following reasons:

- It is a working assumption that the proposed orbit areas will not be segregated;
 - The defined areas will allow interaction on the NATS equipment to ensure controllers are alerted to a potential confliction;
 - Confliction resolution will be tactically managed against the specific aircraft, not the airspace;
 - The airspace will define the scope of the area where the E7 has non-deviating status, which is similar to how the current E3 orbit areas.
- Due to the levels required for orbit, the areas will be fully contained in Class C;
- Through engagement and negotiation, we believe that NATS are likely to influence the location of the orbit areas, hopefully this process will naturally mean that NATS will be able to provide some kind of indication on potential impact on airlines;
- If there are any activation protocols to be worked through, input may be requested from the NATS/MOD joint and integrated Airspace Management Cell.

If, during the course of engagement with NATS, it becomes clear another stakeholder comment is required (for example, due to proximity to international FIR boundaries), then the MOD will inform the CAA and engage with specific stakeholders over specific issues.

Due to the above reasons, the MOD believe the following:

- The GA community have no vested interest (levels, controlled airspace);
- The Airlines should not be considered as stakeholders for engagement purposes (not segregated airspace).
- This will be of no interest to any Aerodromes (levels, controlled airspace).

However, at Stage 3, the MOD will reassess the requirement to consult with the Airlines. This will depend on proposed locations of orbit areas and an assessment, in conjunction with NATS/NM, of the potential impact. The MOD will, at the appropriate time, seek reassurance from the CAA that the proposed consultation strategy will be accepted.

If you have any comments or questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management

CAA, Aviation House | Gatwick Airport South | Crawley | RH6 0YR | Civilian Telephone: [REDACTED] | E-Mail: [REDACTED]

Before Printing consider the environment. This e-mail and any attachment(s) are for authorised use by the intended recipient(s) only. It may contain proprietary material, confidential information and/or be subject to legal privilege. If you are not an intended recipient then please promptly delete this e-mail, as well as any associated attachment(s) and inform the sender. It should not be copied, disclosed to, retained or used by, any other party. Thank you. We cannot accept any liability for any loss or damage sustained as a result of software viruses. You must carry out such virus checking as is necessary before opening any attachment to this message. Please note that all e-mail messages sent to the Civil Aviation Authority are subject to monitoring / interception for lawful business.

Archived: 11 February 2021 14:14:32

From: [Redacted]

Sent: Fri, 11 Dec 2020 07:06:14

To: [Redacted]

Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: FW: ACP-2020-24 Draft Design Principles

Sensitivity: Normal

Attachments:

RE_20200715-ACP 2020 24 E7 limited engagement justification.msg;

Good Morning [Redacted],

I hope you are well? It was nice to meet you the other week on our Teams mtg.

PSB and attached for information on the Design Principles for the MOD's Stage 1 submission with regard to E7 UK Orbit Areas.

As agreed with the CAA (see attached email), NATS are currently the only identified external stakeholder to the ACP and as such we would like to invite comment from you on the Design Principles listed below. Could you please coordinate that comment from NATS and reply direct to [Redacted] with myself cc'd, prior to 7 Jan 2021? If this timescale does not work then please contact [Redacted] direct to discuss.

I would like to thank you in advance for your time and look forward to working with you on this ACP.

Please do not hesitate to contact either of us for further information or to answer any questions you may have.

Regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted] | Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management |
Aviation House | 1E Bechive Ringroad, Crawley, West Sussex, RH6 0YR | Civilian Telephone: [Redacted] | Skype: [Redacted] | E-Mail: [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 10 December 2020 18:05

To: [Redacted]

Subject: ACP-2020-24 Draft Design Principles

[Redacted]

As discussed here are the draft design principles that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) is proposing for the introduction of new orbit areas for E-7 Wedgetail Airborne Early Warning (AEW) Mk1. The MOD presented the CAA with rational to limit engagement to a single stakeholder, NATS, after the ACP Assessment Meeting. The CAA accepted the rational and confirmed such in an email dated 20/07/20 (attached).

As you know this process is at its very early stages and is being managed by the Defence Unmanned Air Systems Capability Development Centre (UAS CDC) for and on behalf of the MOD. The design principle development and agreement are part of ACP Stage 1.

The Statement of Need is as follows: *Currently the E-3D Sentry AEW Mk 1 utilises the UK AEW areas for UK training and operations. In 2023 the E-7 Airborne Early Warning Wedgetail Mk 1 will enter RAF service. Though fulfilling the same role as the Sentry, advances in technology mean that the Wedgetail will not be able to utilise the same orbits, although existing ones may still be utilised by our NATO/visiting forces partners. The Wedgetail will be required to fly 100 nm by 20 nm racetracks. In some UK AEW areas such as UK 1, 7 and 9 these racetrack parameters can be accommodated in the existing airspace structure. However, agreed structures /routes or suitable orbit/racetrack areas will be required in the North Sea area where the current Orbit Areas are not sufficient.*

The draft design principles proposed by the MOD are as follows:

| | |
|---|--|
| a | Must be safe. The defined airspace must provide ATS providers a known traffic environment to ensure safe separation against GAT. |
| b | Defined areas must be sufficient in location to achieve training and operational objectives. |
| c | Defined areas must be sufficient dimensions to achieve task. |
| d | Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow. |

The MOD sees NATS as its only stakeholder at this time. However, as negotiations develop during Stage 2 of the ACP, if airline impacts are identified, the MOD will engage directly with those stakeholders.

The MOD would like to invite NATS to consider the draft design principles and would be grateful for feedback by 7th January 2021. If this timeframe is too tight please advise and more time can be allocated – it's a busy time of year.

[Redacted]

Air Traffic Management Specialist
Defence UAS Capability Development Centre

Telephone No: [Redacted]
Mobile No: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This email and any attachments to it may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must neither take any action based upon its contents, nor copy or show it to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error. QinetiQ retains personal data relating to our customers and partners for the purposes of conducting a business relationship, communicating and marketing to them as well as to providing invitations to upcoming events. Please see our [Privacy Notice](#) for further information. In accordance with our Privacy Notice, you have the right to withdraw your consent at any time. QinetiQ may monitor email traffic data and also the

Archived: 11 February 2021 14:14:45
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Fri, 22 Jan 2021 06:36:36
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: ACP-2020-24 Draft Design Principles
Sensitivity: Normal

Thanks [REDACTED]

Not a problem, and thanks for the suggestions. They look sensible to me; however, I shall let [REDACTED] and her Team get back to you once they have reviewed them as well, in the event that we have any questions.

Regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] | Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management |
Aviation House | 1E Beehive Ringroad | Crawley | West Sussex | RH6 0YR | Civilian Telephone: [REDACTED] | Skype: [REDACTED] | E-Mail: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 January 2021 13:25
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: ACP-2020-24 Draft Design Principles

Hi [REDACTED]
Hope you are well! Thanks for giving NATS more time to review the design principles. We have amended c slightly (see **highlighted text**) and have suggested some additional design principles (e-j). Happy to discuss further.

| | |
|---|--|
| a | Must be safe. The defined airspace must provide ATS providers a known traffic environment to ensure safe separation against GAT. |
| b | Defined areas must be sufficient in location to achieve training and operational objectives. |
| c | Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task. |
| d | Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow. |
| e | Airspace management and FUA principles will be applied to ensure collaborative decision making protocols and management processes are established |
| f | Defined areas must not increase sector complexity or affect sector capacity |
| g | Defined areas shall not be segregated airspace but will align to current or revised procedures detailed within current NATS/MOD interface documents. |
| h | The defined areas will detail the separation standard required between GAT and the OAT using the designated area |
| i | The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate |
| j | The design shall minimise the impact on all ATM stakeholders. This will include NATS and other ANSPs (including foreign ANSPs) so as not to over complicate airspace, sector design and service provision. |

Regards

[REDACTED]
NATS
[REDACTED]
Manager NATS Operational Policy
M: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]



NATS PRIVATE

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 December 2020 07:05
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: ACP-2020-24 Draft Design Principles

Good Morning [REDACTED],
I hope you are well? It was nice to meet you the other week on our Teams mtg.
PSB and attached for information on the Design Principles for the MOD's Stage 1 submission with regard to E7 UK Orbit Areas.

As agreed with the CAA (see attached email) , NATS are currently the only identified external stakeholder to the ACP and as such we would like to invite comment from you on the Design Principles listed below. Could you please coordinate that comment from NATS and reply direct to [REDACTED] with myself cc'd, prior to 7 Jan 2021? If this timescale does not work then please contact [REDACTED] direct to discuss.

I would like to thank you in advance for your time and look forward to working with you on this ACP.

Please do not hesitate to contact either of us for further information or to answer any questions you may have.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management |
Aviation House | 1E Beehive Ringroad Crawley West Sussex RH6 0YR | Civilian Telephone: [REDACTED] | Skype: [REDACTED] | E-Mail: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 December 2020 18:05
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: ACP-2020-24 Draft Design Principles

[REDACTED]

As discussed here are the draft design principles that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) is proposing for the introduction of new orbit areas for E-7 Wedgetail Airborne Early Warning (AEW) Mk1. The MOD presented the CAA with rational to limit engagement to a single stakeholder, NATS, after the ACP Assessment Meeting. The CAA accepted the rational and confirmed such in an email dated 20/07/20 (attached).

As you know this process is at its very early stages and is being managed by the Defence Unmanned Air Systems Capability Development Centre (UAS CDC) for and on behalf of the MOD. The design principle development and agreement are part of ACP Stage 1.

The Statement of Need is as follows: *Currently the E-3D Sentry AEW Mk 1 utilises the UK AEW areas for UK training and operations. In 2023 the E-7 Airborne Early Warning Wedgetail Mk 1 will enter RAF service. Though fulfilling the same role as the Sentry, advances in technology mean that the Wedgetail will not be able to utilise the same orbits, although existing ones may still be utilised by our NATO/visiting forces partners. The Wedgetail will be required to fly 100 nm by 20 nm racetracks. In some UK AEW areas such as UK 1, 7 and 9 these racetrack parameters can be accommodated in the existing airspace structure. However, agreed structures /routes or suitable orbit/racetrack areas will be required in the North Sea area where the current Orbit Areas are not sufficient.*

The draft design principles proposed by the MOD are as follows:

| | |
|---|--|
| a | Must be safe. The defined airspace must provide ATS providers a known traffic environment to ensure safe separation against GAT. |
| b | Defined areas must be sufficient in location to achieve training and operational objectives. |
| c | Defined areas must be sufficient dimensions to achieve task. |
| d | Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow. |

The MOD sees NATS as its only stakeholder at this time. However, as negotiations develop during Stage 2 of the ACP, if airline impacts are identified, the MOD will engage directly with those stakeholders.

The MOD would like to invite NATS to consider the draft design principles and would be grateful for feedback by 7th January 2021. If this timeframe is too tight please advise and more time can be allocated – it's a busy time of year.

[REDACTED]

Air Traffic Management Specialist
Defence UAS Capability Development Centre

Telephone No: [REDACTED]
Mobile No: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This email and any attachments to it may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must neither take any action based upon its contents, nor copy or show it to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error. QinetiQ retains personal data relating to our customers and partners for the purposes of conducting a business relationship, communicating and marketing to them as well as to providing invitations to upcoming events. Please see our [Privacy Notice](#) for further information. In accordance with our Privacy Notice, you have the right to withdraw your consent at any time. QinetiQ may monitor email traffic data and also the content of email for the purposes of security. QinetiQ Limited (Registered in England & Wales: Company Number: 3796233) Registered office: Cody Technology Park, Ivelly Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, GU14 0LX <https://www.qinetiq.com>

If you are not the intended recipient, please notify our Help Desk at Email.Information.Solutions@nats.co.uk immediately. You should not copy or use this email or attachment(s) for any purpose nor disclose their contents to any other person.

NATS computer systems may be monitored and communications carried on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system.

Please note that neither NATS nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses or any losses caused as a result of viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

NATS means NATS (En Route) plc (company number: 4129273), NATS (Services) Ltd (company number 4129270), NATSNAV Ltd (company number: 4164590) or NATS Ltd (company number 3155567) or NATS Holdings Ltd (company number 4138218). All companies are registered in England and their registered office is at 4000 Parkway, Whiteley, Fareham, Hampshire, PO15 7FL.

Archived: 11 February 2021 14:14:54

From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

Sensitivity: Normal

All,

Herewith a summary of our discussion yesterday.

Present:

Apologies:

This the CAA has agreed that this ACP can be managed under the targeted engagement principle, with NATS being the only stakeholder for the MOD to engage with. In accordance with Stage 1 of the CAP 1616 process, the MOD had forwarded a set of draft Design Principles (DPs) for consideration by NATS. NATS had responded with a minor amendment to DP(d) and had added a further 6 additional DPs (e – j) for consideration. The purpose of this meeting was to confirm the intent behind the new DPs with MOD SMEs. The 10 draft DPs were as follows:

| DP No | DRAFT DPs |
|-------|---|
| a | <i>Must be safe. The defined airspace must provide ATS providers a known traffic environment to ensure safe separation against GAT.</i> |
| b | <i>Defined areas must be sufficient in location to achieve training and operational objectives.</i> |
| c | <i>Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task.</i> |
| d | <i>Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow.</i> |
| e | <i>Airspace management and FUA principles will be applied to ensure collaborative decision making protocols and management processes are established</i> |
| f | <i>Defined areas must not increase sector complexity or affect sector capacity</i> |
| g | <i>Defined areas shall not be segregated airspace but will align to current or revised procedures detailed within current NATS/MOD interface documents.</i> |
| h | <i>The defined areas will detail the separation standard required between GAT and the OAT using the designated area</i> |
| i | <i>The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate</i> |
| j | <i>The design shall minimise the impact on all ATM stakeholders. This will include NATS and other ANSPs (including foreign ANSPs) so as not to over complicate airspace, sector design and service provision.</i> |

Discussion and Agreement:

1. DP(a) accepted.
2. DP(b) accepted.
3. DP(c) NATS suggested this DP was amended from "Defined areas must be sufficient dimensions to achieve task." to "Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task." Amendment accepted by MOD.
4. DP(d) amalgamated with DP(f) to read "Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow, sector complexity and sector capacity."
5. DP(e) – NATS explained that the means of activation of the current orbit areas are detailed in Interface Document No 8 (joint NATS & ISTAR document). Swanwick(Mil) Sup will request activation of an orbit area via civil Sector Sup, providing the requested level and time on task. System labelling of the aircraft takes place enabling sector controllers to route other aircraft to avoid orbiting aircraft. The area is not avoided, rather the aircraft is avoided via extant procedures (e.g. Non-Deviating Status (NDS) with a Cleared Flight Path (CFP) including RVSM status).
6. DP(f) deleted. Some discussion was had regarding the phrasing of this DP. Placing any area within a sector is likely to increase complexity, but it was acknowledged that capacity might not be affected. The anticipated orbit levels would be FL270 – FL330. Which is unlikely to be in part of a sector where capacity is likely to be affected. It was felt appropriate to amalgamate DP(f) with DP(d) as above.
7. DP(h) accepted.
8. DP(i) accepted. The intention here is to reduce / remove / repurpose areas which are or will become surplus to requirements (e.g. HIHAZ areas for Sentinel when it goes out of Service).
9. DP(j) accepted. NATS explained the additional work that would be required for cross-border areas to be set up, which would include setting up procedures with foreign ANSPs.

The 9 DPs as agreed to date are:

| DP No | Agreed DPs |
|-------|---|
| a | <i>Must be safe. The defined airspace must provide ATS providers a known traffic environment to ensure safe separation against GAT.</i> |
| b | <i>Defined areas must be sufficient in location to achieve training and operational objectives.</i> |
| c | <i>Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task.</i> |
| d | <i>Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow, sector complexity and sector capacity.</i> |
| e | <i>Airspace management and FUA principles will be applied to ensure collaborative decision making protocols and management processes are established.</i> |
| f | <i>Defined areas shall not be segregated airspace but will align to current or revised procedures detailed within current NATS/MOD interface documents.</i> |
| g | <i>The defined areas will detail the separation standard required between GAT and the OAT using the designated area.</i> |
| h | <i>The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate.</i> |
| i | <i>The design shall minimise the impact on all ATM stakeholders. This will include NATS and other ANSPs (including</i> |

foreign ANSPs) so as not to over complicate airspace, sector design and service provision.

Other points:

- It was recognised that as the ACP would not be restricted to the North Sea area, NATS felt that the civil Swanwick team should be included in the airspace design option work.
- The MOD has some potential locations already sketched out, with relevant justifications. These would be shared with NATS asap.
- NATS brought up the requirements for Aeronautical Data Quality and the fact that the MOD does not have the capability to provide aeronautical data to the required standard. The MOD recognised that it could not support this function. Clarification of this would need to be sought and potential engagement with FMARS pursued. (would highlight with the DAATM).
- The MOD sought to ensure that any new orbit locations would remain fit for purpose, should a new style of establishing segregated airspace/operating areas be brought on-stream (tactically booked volumes as opposed to extant danger areas). NATS advised that this type of airspace construct / concept was not yet being developed. Should such a flexible approach be considered in the future, it was likely that the orbit areas would be similarly managed. Nevertheless, the MOD felt that seeking longevity of any new orbit areas was an important principle. would investigate the value of inserting a new DP and would respond to for further discussion.
- E-7 In-Service Date is for further discussion.
- NATS would forward the Sentinel HIHAZ areas to

Please advise of any corrections to the record above.

Air Traffic Management Specialist
Defence UAS Capability Development Centre

Telephone No:
Mobile No:
Email:

UAS CDC

 Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Archived: 11 February 2021 14:15:02

From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]

Subject: UC FW: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

Sensitivity: Normal

Hi all,

Would you take a look at [Redacted] suggested amendment to DP(h)? I have concerns about how future changes could be forced to consider the orbit areas, simply because we say they should in a DP. I may have lost the plot, but would welcome your thoughts?

Presume also that any tactical orbit requirements in the national interest are outside this ACP, likewise the radiating limitations. I'm checking these 2 points with the DAATM too.

[Redacted]

Air Traffic Management Specialist
Defence UAS Capability Development Centre

Telephone No: [Redacted]
Mobile No: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 03 February 2021 09:39

To: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

Ali,

Thanks for this, I would like to propose the following DP alteration to DP h, as it fits hand-in-hand as I see it:

h. *The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate; any subsequent airspace/ construct changes must consider further re-design of orbit locations.*

I also had some thoughts about the actual tactical manoeuvrability of the air system. Can I just check, at this stage that we are simply deciding on where to place the orbits? Not any regulations on where the air system can radiate etc?

My main concern is [Redacted]
Does this need to be put forward as a DP or is this a requirement for a separate Memorandum of Understanding with NATS?

Thanks for your assistance.

Regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted] | 1Gp ISTAR FHQ
RAF Waddington | Waddington | Lincolnshire | LN5 9NB | Tel: [Redacted] | Mob: [Redacted] | [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 02 February 2021 19:39

To: [Redacted]

Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

All,

Herewith a summary of our discussion yesterday.

Present: [Redacted]

Apologies: [Redacted]

This the CAA has agreed that this ACP can be managed under the targeted engagement principle, with NATS being the only stakeholder for the MOD to engage with. In accordance with Stage 1 of the CAP 1616 process, the MOD had forwarded a set of draft Design Principles (DPs) for consideration by NATS. NATS had responded with a minor amendment to DP(d) and had added a further 6 additional DPs (e – j) for consideration. The purpose of this meeting was to confirm the intent behind the new DPs with MOD SMEs. The 10 draft DPs were as follows:

| DP No | DRAFT DPs |
|-------|--|
| a | <i>Must be safe. The defined airspace must provide ATS providers a known traffic environment to ensure safe separation</i> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | against GAT. |
| b | Defined areas must be sufficient in location to achieve training and operational objectives. |
| c | Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task. |
| d | Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow. |
| e | Airspace management and FUA principles will be applied to ensure collaborative decision making protocols and management processes are established |
| f | Defined areas must not increase sector complexity or affect sector capacity |
| g | Defined areas shall not be segregated airspace but will align to current or revised procedures detailed within current NATS/MOD interface documents. |
| h | The defined areas will detail the separation standard required between GAT and the OAT using the designated area |
| i | The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate |
| j | The design shall minimise the impact on all ATM stakeholders. This will include NATS and other ANSPs (including foreign ANSPs) so as not to over complicate airspace, sector design and service provision. |

Discussion and Agreement:

1. DP(a) accepted.
2. DP(b) accepted.
3. DP(c) NATS suggested this DP was amended from "Defined areas must be sufficient dimensions to achieve task." to "Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task." Amendment accepted by MOD.
4. DP(d) amalgamated with DP(f) to read "Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow, sector complexity and sector capacity."
5. DP(e) – NATS explained that the means of activation of the current orbit areas are detailed in Interface Document No 8 (joint NATS & ISTAR document). Swanwick(Mil) Sup will request activation of an orbit area via civil Sector Sup, providing the requested level and time on task. System labelling of the aircraft takes place enabling sector controllers to route other aircraft to avoid orbiting aircraft. The area is not avoided, rather the aircraft is avoided via extant procedures (e.g. Non-Deviating Status (NDS) with a Cleared Flight Path (CFP) including RVSM status).
6. DP(f) deleted. Some discussion was had regarding the phrasing of this DP. Placing any area within a sector is likely to increase complexity, but it was acknowledged that capacity might not be affected. The anticipated orbit levels would be FL270 – FL330. Which is unlikely to be in part of a sector where capacity is likely to be affected. It was felt appropriate to amalgamate DP(f) with DP(d) as above.
7. DP(h) accepted.
8. DP(i) accepted. The intention here is to reduce / remove / repurpose areas which are or will become surplus to requirements (e.g. HIHAZ areas for Sentinel when it goes out of Service).
9. DP(j) accepted. NATS explained the additional work that would be required for cross-border areas to be set up, which would include setting up procedures with foreign ANSPs.

The 9 DPs as agreed to date are:

| DP No | Agreed DPs |
|-------|--|
| a | Must be safe. The defined airspace must provide ATS providers a known traffic environment to ensure safe separation against GAT. |
| b | Defined areas must be sufficient in location to achieve training and operational objectives. |
| c | Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task. |
| d | Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow, sector complexity and sector capacity. |
| e | Airspace management and FUA principles will be applied to ensure collaborative decision making protocols and management processes are established. |
| f | Defined areas shall not be segregated airspace but will align to current or revised procedures detailed within current NATS/MOD interface documents. |
| g | The defined areas will detail the separation standard required between GAT and the OAT using the designated area. |
| h | The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate. |
| i | The design shall minimise the impact on all ATM stakeholders. This will include NATS and other ANSPs (including foreign ANSPs) so as not to over complicate airspace, sector design and service provision. |

Other points:

- It was recognised that as the ACP would not be restricted to the North Sea area, NATS felt that the civil Swanwick team should be included in the airspace design option work.
- The MOD has some potential locations already sketched out, with relevant justifications. These would be shared with NATS asap.
- NATS brought up the requirements for Aeronautical Data Quality and the fact that the MOD does not have the capability to provide aeronautical data to the required standard. The MOD recognised that it could not support this function. Clarification of this would need to be sought and potential engagement with FMARS pursued. (█ would highlight with the DAATM).
- The MOD sought to ensure that any new orbit locations would remain fit for purpose, should a new style of establishing segregated airspace/operating areas be brought on-stream (tactically booked volumes as opposed to extant danger areas). NATS advised that this type of airspace construct / concept was not yet being developed. Should such a flexible approach be considered in the future, it was likely that the orbit areas would be similarly managed. Nevertheless, the MOD felt that seeking longevity of any new orbit areas was an important principle. █ would investigate the value of inserting a new DP and would respond to █ for further discussion.
- E-7 In-Service Date is █
- NATS █ would forward the Sentinel HIHAZ areas to █

Please advise of any corrections to the record above.

█

Air Traffic Management Specialist
Defence UAS Capability Development Centre

Telephone No: █
Mobile No: █
Email: █



This email and any attachments to it may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must neither take any action based upon its contents, nor copy or show it to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error. QinetiQ retains personal data relating to our customers and partners for the purposes of conducting a business relationship, communicating and marketing to them as well as to providing invitations to upcoming events. Please see our [Privacy Notice](#) for further information. In accordance with our Privacy Notice, you have the right to withdraw your consent at any time. QinetiQ may monitor email traffic data and also the content of email for the purposes of security. QinetiQ Limited (Registered in England & Wales: Company Number: 3796233) Registered office: Cody Technology Park, Ively Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, GU14 0LX <https://www.qinetiq.com>

Archived: 11 February 2021 14:15:12

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thu, 4 Feb 2021 15:30:30

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: UC FW: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

Sensitivity: Normal

Hi [REDACTED]

Conscious of ACP deadlines and availability of NATS staff to discuss this, our preference would be to keep DP i (not h as per the email) as is, and not to change it.

With respect to the other questions, tactical handling of the asset can be agreed through LOAs whenever the areas are agreed. We believe this is outside the scope of the ACP.

Hope this helps? [REDACTED]

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Manager NATS Operational Policy

M: [REDACTED]



NATS PRIVATE

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 03 February 2021 13:51

[REDACTED]

Subject: UC FW: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

Hi all,

Would you take a look at [REDACTED] suggested amendment to DP(h)? I have concerns about how future changes could be forced to consider the orbit areas, simply because we say they should in a DP. I may have lost the plot, but would welcome your thoughts?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Air Traffic Management Specialist
Defence UAS Capability Development Centre

Telephone No: [REDACTED]
Mobile No: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 03 February 2021 09:39

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

[REDACTED]

Thanks for this, I would like to propose the following DP alteration to DP h, as it fits hand-in-hand as I see it:

h. *The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate; any subsequent airspace/ construct changes must consider further re-design of orbit locations.*

I also had some thoughts about the actual tactical manoeuvrability of the air system. Can I just check, at this stage that we are simply deciding on where to place the orbits? Not any regulations on where the air system can radiate etc?

[REDACTED]

Thanks for your assistance.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 February 2021 19:39
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

All,
Herewith a summary of our discussion yesterday.

Present:
[REDACTED]

Apologies:
[REDACTED]

This the CAA has agreed that this ACP can be managed under the targeted engagement principle, with NATS being the only stakeholder for the MOD to engage with. In accordance with Stage 1 of the CAP 1616 process, the MOD had forwarded a set of draft Design Principles (DPs) for consideration by NATS. NATS had responded with a minor amendment to DP(d) and had added a further 6 additional DPs (e – j) for consideration. The purpose of this meeting was to confirm the intent behind the new DPs with MOD SMEs. The 10 draft DPs were as follows:

| DP No | DRAFT DPs |
|-------|---|
| a | <i>Must be safe. The defined airspace must provide ATS providers a known traffic environment to ensure safe separation against GAT.</i> |
| b | <i>Defined areas must be sufficient in location to achieve training and operational objectives.</i> |
| c | <i>Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task.</i> |
| d | <i>Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow.</i> |
| e | <i>Airspace management and FUA principles will be applied to ensure collaborative decision making protocols and management processes are established</i> |
| f | <i>Defined areas must not increase sector complexity or affect sector capacity</i> |
| g | <i>Defined areas shall not be segregated airspace but will align to current or revised procedures detailed within current NATS/MOD interface documents.</i> |
| h | <i>The defined areas will detail the separation standard required between GAT and the OAT using the designated area</i> |
| i | <i>The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate</i> |
| j | <i>The design shall minimise the impact on all ATM stakeholders. This will include NATS and other ANSPs (including foreign ANSPs) so as not to over complicate airspace, sector design and service provision.</i> |

Discussion and Agreement:

1. DP(a) accepted.
2. DP(b) accepted.
3. DP(c) NATS suggested this DP was amended from "Defined areas must be sufficient dimensions to achieve task." to "Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task." Amendment accepted by MOD.
4. DP(d) amalgamated with DP(f) to read "Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow, sector complexity and sector capacity."
5. DP(e) – NATS explained that the means of activation of the current orbit areas are detailed in Interface Document No 8 (joint NATS & ISTAR document). Swanwick(Mil) Sup will request activation of an orbit area via civil Sector Sup, providing the requested level and time on task. System labelling of the aircraft takes place enabling sector controllers to route other aircraft to avoid orbiting aircraft. The area is not avoided, rather the aircraft is avoided via extant procedures (e.g. Non-Deviating Status (NDS) with a Cleared Flight Path (CFP) including RVSM status).
6. DP(f) deleted. Some discussion was had regarding the phrasing of this DP. Placing any area within a sector is likely to increase complexity, but it was acknowledged that capacity might not be affected. The anticipated orbit levels would be FL270 – FL330. Which is unlikely to be in part of a sector where capacity is likely to be affected. It was felt appropriate to amalgamate DP(f) with DP(d) as above.
7. DP(h) accepted.
8. DP(i) accepted. The intention here is to reduce / remove / repurpose areas which are or will become surplus to requirements (e.g. HIHAZ areas for Sentinel when it goes out of Service).
9. DP(j) accepted. NATS explained the additional work that would be required for cross-border areas to be set up, which would include setting up procedures with foreign ANSPs.

The 9 DPs as agreed to date are:

| DP No | Agreed DPs |
|-------|---|
| a | <i>Must be safe. The defined airspace must provide ATS providers a known traffic environment to ensure safe separation against GAT.</i> |
| b | <i>Defined areas must be sufficient in location to achieve training and operational objectives.</i> |
| c | <i>Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task.</i> |
| d | <i>Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow, sector complexity and sector capacity.</i> |
| e | <i>Airspace management and FUA principles will be applied to ensure collaborative decision making protocols and management processes are established.</i> |
| f | <i>Defined areas shall not be segregated airspace but will align to current or revised procedures detailed within current NATS/MOD interface documents.</i> |
| g | <i>The defined areas will detail the separation standard required between GAT and the OAT using the designated area.</i> |

| | |
|---|--|
| h | The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate. |
| i | The design shall minimise the impact on all ATM stakeholders. This will include NATS and other ANSPs (including foreign ANSPs) so as not to over complicate airspace, sector design and service provision. |

Other points:

- It was recognised that as the ACP would not be restricted to the North Sea area, NATS felt that the civil Swanwick team should be included in the airspace design option work.
- The MOD has some potential locations already sketched out, with relevant justifications. These would be shared with NATS asap.
- NATS brought up the requirements for Aeronautical Data Quality and the fact that the MOD does not have the capability to provide aeronautical data to the required standard. The MOD recognised that it could not support this function. Clarification of this would need to be sought and potential engagement with FMARS pursued. (██████████ would highlight with the DAATM).
- The MOD sought to ensure that any new orbit locations would remain fit for purpose, should a new style of establishing segregated airspace/operating areas be brought on-stream (tactically booked volumes as opposed to extant danger areas). NATS advised that this type of airspace construct / concept was not yet being developed. Should such a flexible approach be considered in the future, it was likely that the orbit areas would be similarly managed. Nevertheless, the MOD felt that seeking longevity of any new orbit areas was an important principle. ██████████ would investigate the value of inserting a new DP and would respond to ██████████ for further discussion.
- E-7 In-Service Date is ██████████.
- NATS ██████████ would forward the Sentinel HIHAZ areas to ██████████.

Please advise of any corrections to the record above.

██████████

Air Traffic Management Specialist
Defence UAS Capability Development Centre

Telephone No: ██████████
Mobile No: ██████████

 Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This email and any attachments to it may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must neither take any action based upon its contents, nor copy or show it to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error. QinetiQ retains personal data relating to our customers and partners for the purposes of conducting a business relationship, communicating and marketing to them as well as to providing invitations to upcoming events. Please see our [Privacy Notice](#) for further information. In accordance with our Privacy Notice, you have the right to withdraw your consent at any time. QinetiQ may monitor email traffic data and also the content of email for the purposes of security. QinetiQ Limited (Registered in England & Wales: Company Number: 3796233) Registered office: Cody Technology Park, Ivelly Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, GU14 0LX <https://www.qinetiq.com>

This email and any attachments to it may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must neither take any action based upon its contents, nor copy or show it to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error. QinetiQ retains personal data relating to our customers and partners for the purposes of conducting a business relationship, communicating and marketing to them as well as to providing invitations to upcoming events. Please see our [Privacy Notice](#) for further information. In accordance with our Privacy Notice, you have the right to withdraw your consent at any time. QinetiQ may monitor email traffic data and also the content of email for the purposes of security. QinetiQ Limited (Registered in England & Wales: Company Number: 3796233) Registered office: Cody Technology Park, Ivelly Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, GU14 0LX <https://www.qinetiq.com>

If you are not the intended recipient, please notify our Help Desk at Email.Information.Solutions@nats.co.uk immediately. You should not copy or use this email or attachment(s) for any purpose nor disclose their contents to any other person.

NATS computer systems may be monitored and communications carried on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system.

Please note that neither NATS nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses or any losses caused as a result of viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

NATS means NATS (En Route) plc (company number: 4129273), NATS (Services) Ltd (company number 4129270), NATSNAV Ltd (company number: 4164590) or NATS Ltd (company number 3155567) or NATS Holdings Ltd (company number 4138218). All companies are registered in England and their registered office is at 4000 Parkway, Whiteley, Fareham, Hampshire, PO15 7FL.

Archived: 11 February 2021 14:15:25

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: UC FW: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24
Sensitivity: Normal

[REDACTED]

I thought I had replied, so apologies. I agree to keep the DP as agreed on 1 Feb meeting. It is actually DP(h) in the final agreed DPs as listed in the second table in my email of 2 Feb.

[REDACTED]

Air Traffic Management Specialist
Defence UAS Capability Development Centre

Telephone No: [REDACTED]
Mobile No: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 February 2021 15:17
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: UC FW: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

Hi [REDACTED]

Conscious of ACP deadlines and availability of NATS staff to discuss this, our preference would be to keep DP i (not h as per the email) as is, and not to change it.

With respect to the other questions, tactical handling of the asset can be agreed through LOAs whenever the areas are agreed. We believe this is outside the scope of the ACP.

Hope this helps? [REDACTED]

Regards

[REDACTED]



Manager NATS Operational Policy

M: [REDACTED]



NATS PRIVATE

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2021 13:51
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: UC FW: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

Hi all,

Would you take a look at [REDACTED] suggested amendment to DP(h)? I have concerns about how future changes could be forced to consider the orbit areas, simply because we say they should in a DP. I may have lost the plot, but would welcome your thoughts?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Air Traffic Management Specialist
Defence UAS Capability Development Centre

Telephone No: [REDACTED]
Mobile No: [REDACTED]



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2021 09:39
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

Thanks for this, I would like to propose the following DP alteration to DP h, as it fits hand-in-hand as I see it:

h. *The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate; any subsequent airspace/ construct changes must consider further re-design of orbit locations.*


I also had some thoughts about the actual tactical manoeuvrability of the air system. Can I just check, at this stage that we are simply deciding on where to place the orbits? Not any regulations on where the air system can radiate etc?

Thanks for your assistance.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | 1Gp ISTAR FHQ 
RAF Waddington | Waddington | Lincolnshire | LN5 9NB | Tel: [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED] | [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 February 2021 19:39
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: UC Summary of DP discussion for ACP-2020-24

All,
Herewith a summary of our discussion yesterday.

Present:
[REDACTED]

Apologies:
[REDACTED]

This the CAA has agreed that this ACP can be managed under the targeted engagement principle, with NATS being the only stakeholder for the MOD to engage with. In accordance with Stage 1 of the CAP 1616 process, the MOD had forwarded a set of draft Design Principles (DPs) for consideration by NATS. NATS had responded with a minor amendment to DP(d) and had added a further 6 additional DPs (e – j) for consideration. The purpose of this meeting was to confirm the intent behind the new DPs with MOD SMEs. The 10 draft DPs were as follows:

| DP No | DRAFT DPs |
|-------|---|
| a | <i>Must be safe. The defined airspace must provide ATS providers a known traffic environment to ensure safe separation against GAT.</i> |
| b | <i>Defined areas must be sufficient in location to achieve training and operational objectives.</i> |
| c | <i>Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task.</i> |
| d | <i>Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow.</i> |
| e | <i>Airspace management and FUA principles will be applied to ensure collaborative decision making protocols and management processes are established</i> |
| f | <i>Defined areas must not increase sector complexity or affect sector capacity</i> |
| g | <i>Defined areas shall not be segregated airspace but will align to current or revised procedures detailed within current NATS/MOD interface documents.</i> |
| h | <i>The defined areas will detail the separation standard required between GAT and the OAT using the designated area</i> |
| i | <i>The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate</i> |
| j | <i>The design shall minimise the impact on all ATM stakeholders. This will include NATS and other ANSPs (including foreign ANSPs) so as not to over complicate airspace, sector design and service provision.</i> |

Discussion and Agreement:

1. DP(a) accepted.
2. DP(b) accepted.
3. DP(c) NATS suggested this DP was amended from "Defined areas must be sufficient dimensions to achieve task." to "Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task." Amendment accepted by MOD.
4. DP(d) amalgamated with DP(f) to read "Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow, sector complexity and sector capacity."
5. DP(e) – NATS explained that the means of activation of the current orbit areas are detailed in Interface Document No 8 (joint NATS & ISTAR document). Swarwick(Mil) Sup will request activation of an orbit area via civil Sector Sup, providing the requested level and time on task. System labelling of the aircraft takes place enabling sector controllers to route other aircraft to avoid orbiting aircraft. The area is not avoided, rather the aircraft is avoided via extant procedures (e.g. Non-Deviating Status (NDS) with a Cleared Flight Path (CFP) including RVSM status).

6. DP(f) deleted. Some discussion was had regarding the phrasing of this DP. Placing any area within a sector is likely to increase complexity, but it was acknowledged that capacity might not be affected. The anticipated orbit levels would be FL270 – FL330. Which is unlikely to be in part of a sector where capacity is likely to be affected. It was felt appropriate to amalgamate DP(f) with DP(d) as above.
7. DP(h) accepted.
8. DP(i) accepted. The intention here is to reduce / remove / repurpose areas which are or will become surplus to requirements (e.g. HIHAZ areas for Sentinel when it goes out of Service).
9. DP(j) accepted. NATS explained the additional work that would be required for cross-border areas to be set up, which would include setting up procedures with foreign ANSPs.

The 9 DPs as agreed to date are:

| DP No | Agreed DPs |
|-------|--|
| a | Must be safe. The defined airspace must provide ATS providers a known traffic environment to ensure safe separation against GAT. |
| b | Defined areas must be sufficient in location to achieve training and operational objectives. |
| c | Defined areas must be the minimum dimension to achieve task. |
| d | Minimise the impact to Commercial Air Traffic flow, sector complexity and sector capacity. |
| e | Airspace management and FUA principles will be applied to ensure collaborative decision making protocols and management processes are established. |
| f | Defined areas shall not be segregated airspace but will align to current or revised procedures detailed within current NATS/MOD interface documents. |
| g | The defined areas will detail the separation standard required between GAT and the OAT using the designated area. |
| h | The design shall seek to rationalise existing areas where appropriate. |
| i | The design shall minimise the impact on all ATM stakeholders. This will include NATS and other ANSPs (including foreign ANSPs) so as not to over complicate airspace, sector design and service provision. |

Other points:

- It was recognised that as the ACP would not be restricted to the North Sea area, NATS felt that the civil Swanwick team should be included in the airspace design option work.
- The MOD has some potential locations already sketched out, with relevant justifications. These would be shared with NATS asap.
- NATS brought up the requirements for Aeronautical Data Quality and the fact that the MOD does not have the capability to provide aeronautical data to the required standard. The MOD recognised that it could not support this function. Clarification of this would need to be sought and potential engagement with FMARS pursued. ([REDACTED] would highlight with the DAATM).
- The MOD sought to ensure that any new orbit locations would remain fit for purpose, should a new style of establishing segregated airspace/operating areas be brought on-stream (tactically booked volumes as opposed to extant danger areas). NATS advised that this type of airspace construct / concept was not yet being developed. Should such a flexible approach be considered in the future, it was likely that the orbit areas would be similarly managed. Nevertheless, the MOD felt that seeking longevity of any new orbit areas was an important principle. [REDACTED] would investigate the value of inserting a new DP and would respond to [REDACTED] for further discussion.
- E-7 In-Service Date is [REDACTED]
- NATS [REDACTED] would forward the Sentinel HIHAZ areas to [REDACTED].

Please advise of any corrections to the record above.

[REDACTED]
 Air Traffic Management Specialist
 Defence UAS Capability Development Centre

Telephone No: [REDACTED]
 Mobile No: [REDACTED]
 Email: [REDACTED]



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This email and any attachments to it may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must neither take any action based upon its contents, nor copy or show it to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error. QinetiQ retains personal data relating to our customers and partners for the purposes of conducting a business relationship, communicating and marketing to them as well as to providing invitations to upcoming events. Please see our [Privacy Notice](#) for further information. In accordance with our Privacy Notice, you have the right to withdraw your consent at any time. QinetiQ may monitor email traffic data and also the content of email for the purposes of security. QinetiQ Limited (Registered in England & Wales: Company Number: 3796233) Registered office: Cody Technology Park, Ively Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, GU14 0LX <https://www.qinetiq.com>
 This email and any attachments to it may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must neither take any action based upon its contents, nor copy or show it to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error. QinetiQ retains personal data relating to our customers and partners for the purposes of conducting a business relationship, communicating and marketing to them as well as to providing invitations to upcoming events. Please see our [Privacy Notice](#) for further information. In accordance with our Privacy Notice, you have the right to withdraw your consent at any time. QinetiQ may monitor email traffic data and also the content of email for the purposes of security. QinetiQ Limited (Registered in England & Wales: Company Number: 3796233) Registered office: Cody Technology Park, Ively Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, GU14 0LX <https://www.qinetiq.com>

If you are not the intended recipient, please notify our Help Desk at Email.Information.Solutions@nats.co.uk immediately. You should not copy or use this email or attachment(s) for any purpose nor disclose their contents to any other person.

NATS computer systems may be monitored and communications carried on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system.

Please note that neither NATS nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses or any losses caused as a result of viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

NATS means NATS (En Route) plc (company number: 4129273), NATS (Services) Ltd (company number 4129270), NATSNAV Ltd (company number: 4164590) or NATS Ltd (company number 3155567) or NATS Holdings Ltd (company number 4138218). All companies are registered in England and their registered office is at 4000 Parkway, Whiteley, Fareham, Hampshire, PO15 7FL.