

Minutes of Stage 1A Airspace Change Request Assessment Meeting

ACP-2020-51 Truncation of EGKK conventional DVR 1M 1V SIDs

ACP-2020-52 Truncation of EGKK conventional CLN 1M 1V 5P 5W SIDs

Date: 7th August 2020 (Microsoft Teams Meeting)

Present:

██████████	Regulatory Lead – Genesis	Gatwick Airport
██████████	Airspace Regulator (Technical) (Case Officer)	CAA
██████████	ATM Consultant	Trax (Gatwick Airport)
██████████	Junior ATM Consultant	Trax (Gatwick Airport)

Minutes:

████ opened the meeting and explained that the CAA had some questions around some of the statements made within the Statement of Need (SoN), particularly around the use of phrases such as ‘negligible change to lateral tracks’.

████ explained that Gatwick had prepared slides which would clarify the reason for these statements and suggested to start with the truncation of the DVR SID.

████ initially explained that all work undertaken in preparation for this meeting was part of an initial investigation into the approximate truncation locations and therefore AIS True Track data has not been used, and location estimations are based on information available in AIP AIRAC 08/2020. Climb gradient calculations to reach 6A have not been performed – for these calculations it has been assumed 6A at ADMAG and FRANE are satisfactory for the truncation fix. █████ also explained that the Magnetic Variation and Station Declination used are as per the AIP, AIRAC 08/2020.

████ explained that when truncating the DVR SIDs, Gatwick are not proposing to shift the traffic from the SID route. The RNAV ADMAG and Conventional (CONV) DVR SID tracks do not follow the same track over the ground from SUNAV to ADMAG and ACORN to DVR. ADMAG therefore doesn’t exist on the DVR CONV SID Route. As Y312 is aligned with ADMAG, the changes as a result of CAP1912 are moving traffic from ADMAG RNAV SID & Y312 to the DVR CONV SID.

████ restated that Gatwick are not proposing to change any tracks on the conventional DVR SID route and explained that it will be CAP1912 that will shift the traffic from RNAV to Conv. Gatwick will then truncate the CONV DVR SID back to a point around ADMAG but not ADMAG itself as this would result in a change to the track of the CONV DVR 1M 1V SID track and this would result in a shift in traffic. The proposed truncation point of the CONV SID is DET D33, 6A point, which is in the vicinity of ADMAG.

████ stated that there was no problem to truncate to D33 at a new point with a 5 letter name code (5LNC). █████ reiterated that ADMAG and the new truncation point are not co located. CAA asked if Gatwick were looking to align Y312 with the new 5LNC and EB confirmed yes. Y312 would need to rotate

to the north by 1.25° and this would connect the new truncation point to the airway network and replace the portion of the CONV DVR SID being removed.

■ explained that this could be problematic as there can be no change to lateral tracks on the SID profile however from D33 there will be a change in tracks. ■ explained this was not correct; the Conv DVR 1M 1V SID track will not change due to this truncation - any change in tracks would be as a result of CAP1912 shifting traffic from the RNAV SID to the CONV SIDs. ■ provided a technical explanation of why CAP1912 will change tracks of flights connecting to Y312 and not this SID truncation.

■ asked if anyone flies the conventional SIDs. ■ stated that some Conventional SIDs are filed but not many. Some radar tracks do exist however CAP1912 will change the volume significantly. This SID truncation will not change the track over the ground of the conventional SIDs

■ asked if Y312 was realigned, would ADMAG remain where it is with the potential in the future for other RNAV routes to start at this point. ■ explained that ADMAG would probably be de-notified and any new RNAV SIDs would be designed through the CAP1616 process therefore the location of them cannot be pre-determined.

■ asked are there any dependencies of ADMAG on other routes in terms of RNAV separation. It was explained that NATS have been engaged in the truncation process and it was agreed that there would need to be written confirmation from NATS.

Action: Confirmation required from NATS that they are happy with the proposed change and there are no other dependencies on ADMAG.

[Post meeting note: Gatwick have spoken with CG (NATS) who has confirmed that Y312 is only used for Gatwick Traffic at this time, and that it is not anticipated to change. EB will provide written confirmation as part of the SID Truncation Request form]

■ stated that in the future, if RNAV SIDs are introduced, the conventional truncation point (D33) will stay – there is no intention to move it back to the current location of ADMAG.

■ explained that he would need to discuss this proposed truncation internally now that he understands the full details and requested a copy of the presentation referred to throughout the conversations. Gatwick agreed to provide the presentation following the meeting.

Action: ■ to provide ■ with details of the location differences between CONV and RNAV DVR SID Truncation Points. ■ confirmed that this will be held confidentially and internally within the CAA.

[Post meeting note: The presentation 'DVR_CLN Conventional SID Truncation fixes_Confidential' has been submitted to the CAA as part of the Stage 1a information pack]

The discussion then moved onto the CLN Truncation ACP.

■ explained that the initial truncation investigation has shown that due to magnetic variation and coordinate rounding that occurs with CONV SIDs, there will be a small change of approx. 100m to the location of the truncation fix. ■ gave an overview of the Mag Var and coordinates used to for the RNAV FRANE fix and then explained how the small difference is calculated for the CONV FRANE location.

■ added that there is no intended fundamental change to the track over the ground with this truncation ACP however Gatwick were concerned that it would be disingenuous to say there would be 'no changes to the existing SID track' when our investigation demonstrates that there would be a very minor change in the fix location and it's coordinates due to rounding and differences in Mag Var. It was highlighted that it is very uncommon for aircraft to be following the SID under their own navigation on this portion of the SID, they are nearly always on ATC vectors

■ agreed that he will go away and articulate this within the CAA and added that he was comfortable with the understanding around this ACP.

The group discussed how issues such as this have been overcome with previous truncation ACPs and suggested that they'd speak to ■ (NATS) to find out further information.

AOB – none

Meeting closed.