Stage 5 Clarification Questions for ACP 2018-65
STAR IFP Tech Amendments

#	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 1.7 ACP Page 31 (b) Non-public documents - (RSAD (sup 03) Issue 2 Procedure design report v2.1)	The STAR Tech amendment document, in para 1.7, states that the as a result of the amendments there is still '*appropriate containment assurance*'. The ACP on page 31 states that the CAS containment will be reduced to 2NM and references the RSAD. We have reviewed the RSAD Issue 2 and it is not clear what the minimum containment will now be for the amended STARs. Please can you provide us with a clear explanation of what the minimum containment will now be for the STARs and confirm that this does not alter your risk assessments in terms of any required mitigations?	Tech/Gen	09/11/2021	See below

Please can you provide us with a clear explanation of what the minimum containment will now be for the STARs

NATS, as the co-sponsor party responsible for the STARs, has used its APD IFP expert to study the STAR nominal track CAS containment for arrivals from the south and east, and they concluded that CAS containment is 2nm or more between FL80 and FL130.

At FL140 the nominal track CAS containment is 1.94nm, i.e. less than 2nm stated in the (commercially confidential) RSAD.

For clarity therefore, the only scenario within the AD6 ACP where RNAV1 STAR CAS containment is less than 2nm (as stated in the RSAD) is where the newly amended STARs from the south and east route COCCU-JUMZI-ZAGZO, and are also FL140 at JUMZI.

Confirm that this does not alter your risk assessments in terms of any required mitigations?

The (commercially confidential) RSAD provides risk assessments and mitigations for 2nm CAS containment throughout this airspace change, and it remains justified for all 2nm scenarios.

Following the identification of the 1.94nm scenario (described above), NATS has verified the risk assessments and mitigations and we confirm that they remain appropriate for this 1.94nm scenario.

For clarity therefore, this does not alter our risk assessments in terms of any required mitigations.

We will ensure the (commercially confidential) RSAD is updated to include this unique scenario ,and would be prepared to supplement our IFP submission if required.