

## NATS-LLA-CAA Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) Discussion 2

Date: 25<sup>th</sup> May 2021

Time: 1600-1700hrs

Via MS Teams

CAA:



CAA Airspace Regulator (IFP)  
CAA Principal Airspace Regulator (IFP)  
CAA Technical Regulator

NATS:



SAIP AD6 APDO  
SAIP AD6 ATC Lead  
SAIP AD6 Deployment Manager  
Airspace Change Expert (Presenter)

Trax

(for LLA):



IFP Designer  
ATM Consultant

Discussion record	Actions
<p><b>Welcome and Introductions</b>    Set up using MS Teams (recording agreed)</p> <p>Slide Pack - Agenda:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welcome, introductions</li> <li>2. Aircraft and FMS types for validation</li> <li>3. STAR designations</li> <li>4. IFP Validation Plan submission timeline</li> <li>5. IAP, RCF, technical discussions</li> <li>6. AOB</li> </ol> <p>There was no presentation.</p>	
<p><b>Brief summary of discussions</b></p> <p>Discussions progressed as per agenda.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welcome, intro Parties were all familiar with each other</li> <li>2. Aircraft and FMS types for validation CAA IFP stated that it was up to Sponsors to decide which airframes and which FMS types are appropriate for validation. NATS-LLA will decide based on LLA fleet mix and sim availability</li> <li>3. STAR designations NATS-LLA stated that Stansted STARs would become letter E, LLA STARs would become letter L, the only common STAR designations would be for very rare LLA non-RNAV1 arrivals (and some LTMA positioning flights) via ABBOT which are likely to remain letter A. CAA IFP has no initial comments.</li> <li>4. IFP Validation Plan submission timeline CAA IFP stated that IFP validation should not commence without CAA agreement of the validation plan. Validation activities undertaken without this agreement is at the Sponsor 's risk.</li> </ol>	

NATS-LLA asked that previous IFP submissions had CAA IFP agreement that comments could be turned around in two weeks to allow for amended requirements should that be necessary following CAA IFP's first look. NATS-LLA plans to submit the IFP validation plans along with the IFP packages, and requests CAA IFP to assess the validation plans first to allow Sponsors to schedule the activities. This was not specifically agreed at the time, but CAA IFP would consider the request.

5. IAP, RCF, technical discussions

LLA via Trax advised CAA IFP that they were planning to use the IFP Submission to modernise some of their IFPs to begin to remove reliance on the LUT NDB and soon to be decommissioned BKY VOR, without changing tracks over the ground. This was largely through the replacement of the very rarely used LUT NDB hold with an RNAV hold. However, CAA IFP advised that they do not allow RNAV Holds to be promulgated on conventional procedures. There was a discussion as to whether the removal of reliance on LUT and BKY was already within scope of AD6, and if not, whether it could be incorporated at Sponsor's risk. Therefore, Luton's IAPs will continue to reference the LUT NDB and BKY VOR as the definition for the hold.

Discussion on the naming and use of approach transitions depend on the outcome of the consultation Option 1 vs Option 2, with RCF considerations also a discussion point. The CAA advised PBN "Approach Transitions" are essentially the PBN equivalent of the current published conventional "Initial Approach Procedure".

6. AOB

CAA Tech Reg requested a record of this meeting be published on the Airspace Change Portal.

NATS-LLA to write up a draft record for CAA review

Action  
NATS-LLA  
(closed)

CAA to review

Action  
CAA Tech Reg  
and IFP Reg  
(closed)

NATS-LLA to publish on the portal.

Action NATS  
(closed)

**Close**

Thanks to attendees

Notes by NATS and Trax Jun 2021, incorporating CAA comments 16/06/2021