

# Stage 5 Clarification Questions for ACP 2018-65

## Supplement – Stansted Climb Performance Evidence Issue 1.1

#	Submission Document Name, Page/Para	Question/Issue	Tech/Conslt/ Env/Econ/ ATM/IFP/ General	Date of response	Response – State if and where a submitted document will be changed.
1	Para 4.5, 5.1, 4.7.2.	<p>It is not clear what ‘met or exceeded means’. You state, ‘<i>The data presented in this section is a ‘snapshot’ of data points through the gates that have been analysed. In that analysis we have assumed that data points within 200ft of the gate altitude are considered as having met that altitude</i>’.</p> <p>Para 4.7.2, for example states, a very small number of aircraft that are within 200ft or ‘actually 100ft’.</p> <p>Please can you be clear what the level/altitude parameters were for aircraft at the Gates?</p>	Tech/Gen	08/11/2021	<p>We clarify that flight data points below the Gate altitude, but within 200ft, are considered to have met the altitude parameter.</p> <p>For example, a flight’s data point of 2,800ft would mean that it was considered as having met a 3,000ft Gate altitude, likewise a data point of 2,900ft.</p> <p>We did, however, supply additional data on those within 200ft below – these were still considered ‘met’, but were a subset of the ‘met’.</p> <p>In doing so, we intended to demonstrate how rare were the outlier flight data points (of 300ft or more below the Gate altitude).</p> <p>However, we understand that this may confuse a reader.</p> <p>Thus we will ensure the ‘200ft consideration’ is made clear, and we will incorporate all the analysis such that the data illustrated is either ‘met’ (including those up to 200ft below) or ‘not met’ (those 300ft or more below the gate altitude).</p> <p><i>Doc update issue 1.2: The analysis paras in Section 4 (including the definition para 4.5) will be updated to be consistent with this met/not met clarification.</i></p>
2	Para 4.8.3	<p>It is implied that the comparison flights, despite going to different destinations, were on the same day in order to demonstrate similarity; please confirm?</p>	Gen	08/11/2021	<p>All comparison flights were on the same day as the identified outlier flight, except for one where there was no similar flight by the same aircraft type on the same day, and is separately discussed.</p> <p><i>Doc update issue 1.2: References to comparison flights will be made explicit as to whether they were same day or not</i></p>

3	Section 5	Please confirm that there will be no impacts on bio-diversity or tranquillity?	Env	08/11/2021	<p>The same minuscule, indiscernible, non-measurable, potential environmental impacts apply, as discussed and expressed in the previous Clarification 4 document.</p> <p><i>Doc update issue 1.2:</i>  <i>Para 5.6 is the primary environmental impact statement. It will be updated to include biodiversity and tranquillity.</i></p>
4	Para 7.2, 7.3	You state that the two operators, currently engaged with, accounted for c.72%, of traffic in the summer period of 2021, what was the percentage for these operators in the 2019 evidence figures, which are used for the gate analysis?	Gen	08/11/2021	<p>Data for the analysis period of summer 1Jun-30Sep, 2019 (pre-pandemic impact on flights) and 2021 (recovering from pandemic impact on flights, overall number significantly lower than 2019) – Stansted departure proportions.</p> <p>In 2019, RYR accounted for c.59% In 2021, RYR accounted for c.66%        In 2019, JET2 accounted for c.9% In 2021, JET2 accounted for c.6%.</p> <p>In 2019 EZY accounted for c.9% In Sep 2020 EZY closed its base at Stansted.        In 2021 EZY accounted for c.3%.</p> <p>With the 2020 closure of EZY’s base at Stansted, the two operators with the greatest proportions of Stansted departures in both 2019 and 2021 remained RYR and JET2.</p> <p><i>Doc update issue 1.2:</i>  <i>Section 7 will be updated to be consistent with the above data.</i></p>

Issue 1.2 will be drafted and uploaded to the Portal.