

West Airspace Deployment

L6203 ACP-2019-12

## Free Route Airspace Deployment 2

### Stage 4: Submit

#### Step 4A: Update Design

### **Annex A**

### **Engagement Evidence**

Example of Engagement Evidence	Pages
1) Engagement with NM regards NPZ publishing	2
2) Engagement with CSFP-PG regards NPZ publishing	3-6
3) Engagement with DAATM	7-12

## Engagement with NM on NPZ definitions

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 May 2022 11:46  
**To:** Airspace Consultation  
**Subject:** UK West Airspace NPZ definitions

---

**From:** [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** 15 March 2022 14:28

**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: UK West Airspace NPZ definitions

Hi [REDACTED],

Theoretically, NPZ existence versus AIP publication is defined only in ERNIP Part 1 as it is not an ICAO airspace volume. NPZ is there as ERNIP includes requirements for particular specific airspace volumes and/or data origination, provision and publication, developed by the Network Manager, existing and applied in Europe for which ICAO does not provide guidance material.

As per ICAO, NPZ is not covered by Doc 10066 PANS-AIM, while in ERNIP is mandatory for publication in AIP ENR 2.2 including mandatory structural identification. Similarity, as mentioned in previous discussions, the case raised was related to Control Sectors, which also by ICAO are not mandatory for AIP publication, while by ERNIP are.

Practically, in this case, if State is not mandated to publish this data, it provides us with relevant data (all what shall be published in AIP), usually as xls file and this data is made available via RAD NOP Portal as it is used in RAD as referenced airspace volume. Based on such file the data enters in CACD and via B2B became available for all users. Responsibility for correct data is not in NM.

Now being outside of EU you might not apply the ERNIP provisions and in that case might not publish in AIP data for NPZs, despite related to FRA. Possibility is xls file with all NPZs used in RAD, structured and coded in accordance with ERNIP, which the NM RAD Team will load it on RAD NOP Portal (after 19 MAY 2022 with new RAD Structure and RAD Application might be on different place but will advise).

This is what is possible to be done, without commenting internal State issues on coordination and requirements by AIS. We can create a template for such file if required.

Hope this might help

Best regards



[REDACTED]  
Head of Section Airspace Design  
NMD/ACD/OPL/DES

## Engagement with CFSPs on NPZ definitions

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 May 2022 11:49  
**To:** Airspace Consultation  
**Subject:** FW: NATS-Jeppesen West Kick Off Meeting

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 May 2022 16:16  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: NATS-Jeppesen West Kick Off Meeting

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

---

Hi [REDACTED]

1 additional response .... from NavBlue. See below:

Best regards

[REDACTED]

Sorry Gents

Finally back home and going through the backlog of emails. Here is my comments:

1. If NATS did not publish further NPZs in the UK AIP ENR 2.2, but these were made available via CACD, would this impact CFSPs ability to apply NPZ reference data?

NAVBLUE: If the NPZ was available via a B2B service, then it would not impact NAVBLUE's ability to apply the NPZ.

1. Would there be any additional requests to supply or publish reference or definition data on NPZs if these were not published in the UK AIP?

NAVBLUE: It would be recommended to continue to have the NPZ in the AIP for a cross-reference. Example: when the route output does not match expectations, the AIP could be consulted to determine the NPZ as the culprit. Without this public information, it would be unknown to the end user as to why airspace is being avoided.

[REDACTED]  
Head of Flight Planning Compliance

[REDACTED]@navblue.aero

[www.navblue.aero](http://www.navblue.aero)



Boeing Global Services

Digital Solutions &amp; AnalytX

ph: [REDACTED]

On 3 May 2022, at 11:33, [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi [REDACTED]

Many thanks for the raising this request and collating feedback from the CFPSPG. Following this feedback, we will plan to proceed with deploying NPZs within existing NM systems and processes.

Thanks again



■■■■■■■■■■

Swanwick FRA Lead

M [REDACTED]

4000 Parkway, Whiteley,  
Fareham, Hants PO15 7FL  
[www.nats.co.uk](http://www.nats.co.uk)

NATS Internal

**From:** [REDACTED]

Sent: 01 May 2022 12:34

To: [REDACTED]

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: NATS-Jeppesen West Kick Off Meeting

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi [REDACTED]

Hope all well

As you know, I asked the members of the Computer Flight Plan Service Provider Group (CFSPG) for an opinion on your question.

Two replies were received:

At AIR SUPPORT, we use CACD data B2B.

We would only consult the AIP, if we suspected that the programming in CACD is in error.

So, answering their questions:

1. If NPZs are available in CACD and published through NMB2B, we (the route generation side of things in AIR SUPPORT, at least) should be all right with that.
2. No additional requests from us if they're going to publish everything relevant through NMB2B.

BAE:

Good Morning [REDACTED],

My input for this issue. We have an established process where NPZ areas are included in the RSA activation messages via the AUP/UUP. I've attached a screenshot of the 2 Italian NPZ areas from the NOP. This process allows automated flight planning systems to ingest these areas along with the other active RSA to ensure any selected routing solutions do not penetrate the defined boundaries with regard to altitude and time constraints.

To answer the questions below, it is always nice to have NPZ areas referenced in the host nation AIP. However, if areas cannot be published in the AIP, but can be included in the AUP/UUP RSA activation messages, flight planning systems using this data should be able to select routing successfully avoiding the applicable NPZ areas.

Please let me know if I can provide any additional information,  
Respectfully, [REDACTED]

They seem broadly aligned to our view ie that it is NOT a problem if NPZs are not published in the AIP

Hope this helps

Best regards

[REDACTED]

ph: [REDACTED] Kingdom

On 14 Apr 2022, at 17:01, [REDACTED] > wrote:

Hi [REDACTED]

Following on from our meeting today could I take you up on your offer to discuss NPZ publication with the CFSP PG next week.

This would be an essential part of stakeholder engagement activity as part of the planned UK ACPs for the next NATS FRA deployment planned in March 2023. Feedback from CFSPs is crucial on this matter.

On the publication of NPZs -

- The ERNIP guidance indicates publication should be at ENR 2.2

- The UK has published 2 NPZs in the Scottish FRA volume which are established for preventing flight planning on intersecting airspace boundaries (Safety Reasons)
- The UK West FRA deployment plans to introduce NPZs as ATFM elements, to provide some structural limitations in high density airspace and to minimise RAD requirements within the FRA Volume (Capacity reasons)
- The final NM pre-validation testing may not be completed before the Double AIRAC cut-off date for AIRAC 2303, if any final adjustments to NPZ volumes are required
- Any changes to NPZ data published in UK AIP requires an ACP to be undertaken, with extra cost and delay in updating information to enable operational efficiencies
- The NPZ data will be made available as referenced airspace volume in CACD, with application data via RAD appendix 7 as normal
- The NPZ data could be published in an separate RAD annex if required

The formal feedback from the CFSP PG would be appreciated on the following

—

1. If NATS did not publish further NPZs in the UK AIP ENR 2.2, but these were made available via CACD, would this impact CFSPs ability to apply NPZ reference data?
2. Would there be any additional requests to supply or publish reference or definition data on NPZs if these were not published in the UK AIP?

Appreciate your assistance on this important item and please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Swanwick FRA Lead

M [Redacted]

4000 Parkway, Whiteley,  
Fareham, Hants PO15 7FL  
[www.nats.co.uk](http://www.nats.co.uk)

## Engagement with DAATM

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** 17 May 2022 16:15  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: D011A/B/C FBZ management

Hi [REDACTED],

Yes if FOST and MAMC are happy, so are DAATM.

Regards

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 May 2022 16:13  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: D011A/B/C FBZ management

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks again for the swift response. Having spoken to the MAM he noted that the same applies to D009B. He has confirmed that he has spoken to FOST and they are content to make this area AMC manageable too. If you can confirm that this is acceptable from the DAATM perspective it would be much appreciated.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
*Manager Airspace Change Compliance and Delivery*

From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: 17 May 2022 16:02

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: D011A/B/C FBZ management

[REDACTED]  
FOST and the MAMC have spoken to each other and are happy to make D007A and B 'AMC Manageable'.

Regards

[REDACTED] | Sqn Ldr | SO2 Airspace Operations | Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management | Aviation House | 1E Beehive Ringroad Crawley West Sussex RH6 0YR | Civilian Telephone: [REDACTED] | [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[uk](#)>

Sent: 17 May 2022 15:15

To: [REDACTED];

Subject: RE: D011A/B/C FBZ management

Thanks [REDACTED]

I'll liaise with the MAM in the meantime.

Regards

[REDACTED]  
Manager Airspace Change Compliance and Delivery

E: [REDACTED]  
[www.nats.co.uk](http://www.nats.co.uk)



From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: 17 May 2022 15:10

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: D011A/B/C FBZ management

Hi [REDACTED],

Ref D011, yes there is still a requirement to activate the airspace up to 24100ft, albeit a very rare one.

Ref D007 I'll get back to you. Might not get an answer until im back off leave w/c 30 May but will see if FOST can speak to MAMC in my absence.

Regards

[REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED] | Sqn Ldr | SO2 Airspace Operations | Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management | Aviation House | 1E Beehive Ringroad Crawley West Sussex RH6 0YR | [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: 17 May 2022 15:04

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: D011A/B/C FBZ management

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for your swift response. Can you confirm if the requirement to activate D011A,B,C to 24100ft remains?

Additionally, we have noted an anomaly in the AIP for the Plymouth DAs which creates the same issue for D007A & D007B These areas are not currently annotated in AIP as AMC manageable and therefore the AMC are unable to apply FBZs in the AUP/UUP:

		Danger Area Authority: HQ Navy. Hours: Mon-Thu 0800-1700 (0700-1600), F
EG D007A FOWEY 501801N 0043643W - 501820N 0043152W - 501857N 0042738W - 501550N 0042458W - 500922N 0044407W - 501202N 0044623W - 501801N 0043643W	Upper limit: 22000 FT ALT Lower limit: SFC	Activity: Ordnance, Munitions and Explosive System (VLOS/BVLOS) / High Energy Man  Service: DACS: Plymouth Military on 121.2 London Information on 124.750 MHz. DAAI  Contact: Pre-flight information / Booking: FO  Danger Area Authority: HQ Navy. Hours: Mon-Thu 0800-1700 (0700-1600), F
EG D007B FOWEY 501550N 0042458W - 501342N 0042309W - 500726N 0044228W - 500922N 0044407W - 501550N 0042458W	Upper limit: 22000 FT ALT Lower limit: SFC	Activity: Ordnance, Munitions and Explosive System (VLOS/BVLOS) / High Energy Man  Service: DACS: Plymouth Military on 121.2 London Information on 124.750 MHz. DAAI  Contact: Pre-flight information / Booking: FO  Danger Area Authority: HQ Navy. Hours: Mon-Thu 0800-1700 (0700-1600), F
EG D007C FOWEY INNER 501700N 004100W - 501300N	Upper limit: 2000 FT ALT Lower limit: SFC	Activity: Ordnance, Munitions and Explosive System (VLOS/BVLOS) / High Energy Man

Can you confirm if the MoD would be content to make D007A & D007B AMC manageable? It would require FOST to include these areas when they request ARES in LARA.

Kind regards

■

---

From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: 17 May 2022 12:52

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: D011A/B/C FBZ management

Hi [REDACTED],

Reference your email at the bottom of this trail below; the MOD are happy to agree with your proposal. This has been discussed between DAATM, DIO and the MAMC. Clearly we are happy for the work to be included in the Western Airspace Change ACP, but if you require and assistance or any other questions then please do not hesitate to contact me.

---

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Sqn Ldr | SO2 Airspace Operations | Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management | Aviation House | 1E Beehive Ringroad Crawley West Sussex RH6 0YR | Civilian Telephone: +44 (0) 1293 76 8703 | Skype: +44 (0) 300 168 8983 | E-Mail: paul.watson373@mod.gov.uk

---

From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: 13 May 2022 07:55

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: D011A/B/C FBZ management

Hi [REDACTED]

That's great, thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] *Change Compliance and Delivery*  
E: [simon.mittins@nats.co.uk](mailto:simon.mittins@nats.co.uk)  
[www.nats.co.uk](http://www.nats.co.uk)

From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: 12 May 2022 15:34

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: [D011A/B/C FBZ management](#)

Hi [REDACTED]

I have a mtg with DIO and MAMC on Mon (hopefully) so will discuss and get back to you.

Regards

[REDACTED] | Sqn Ldr | SO2 Airspace Operations | Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management | Aviation House | 1E Beehive Ringroad Crawley West Sussex RH6 0YR | Civilian Telephone: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 12 May 2022 15:27

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: D011A/B/C FBZ management

Hi [REDACTED]

Following on from our conversation this morning, if the requirement to activate the the Oakhampton Ranges (D011A, B & C) up to 24100ft remains, NATS would like to make them AMC Managed Areas when activated above 10000ft (4500ft for D011B). This will enable the AMC to apply [the appropriate flight plan buffer zone](#) if/when the DA extends [into FRA dependent on QNH](#). It would require a procedure for DIO to notify the MAMC of [their requirements on or before D-1 \(or 0900 on Fridays for weekend & Monday activity\)](#) so that the information can be included in the AUP. Additionally, would you support updating the AIP to reflect the upper limit to 24100ft and include the following remarks:

AMC – Manageable when above 10000ft (4500ft for D011B)  
Vertical Limits: Normally activated to 10000ft (4500ft for D011B)  
(Remove HEM iaw previous discussions)

Your thoughts on this proposal would be much appreciated. Ideally we would like to see if we can incorporate these changes in the West ACPs so a quick response would be much appreciated.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Manager Airspace Change Compliance and Delivery

E: [REDACTED]

[www.nats.co.uk](http://www.nats.co.uk)