

Archived: 13 June 2022 10:24:04
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Fri, 10 Jun 2022 14:23:28
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 20220526-ACP-2021-048 Nomenclature
Sensitivity: Normal

[REDACTED],

I relation to the naming convention for TDA597 and updating to remove the TDA the following information may be useful to the CAA in the investigations to understand the time and cost implications. We do not have any issues with what the name is but we do require it to be named consistently throughout all ATM systems. This applies to both our, NMs and information used by flight plan service providers and airspace users. These systems have to link together otherwise risk is introduced that the assurance of the system and data use diminishes resulting in the required chain of events to manage traffic and flight planning required to take place failing.

We have circa 16 systems that are updated with airspace, ATM data and rules ranging from Flight Data Processors such as iTEC and NAS (which is linked in particular to NERC systems), NODE and others.

Changing the current naming conventions in the system would require all these systems, and in particular the ASM systems utilised by both the MOD and NATS to be updated at the same time as EUROCONTROL NM systems. The RAD would also require to be updated as well as civil flight plan software providers products. These systems currently are adapted with the name "EGTDA597", "EGTDA597Z" and "EGTDA597R" and flow through the European Network Operations Portal (eNOP) to airspace users.

What appears to be a simple update requires multiple system regression testing to ensure the flight planning system operates as required. We would normally undertake these adaptation changes in our AIRAC cycle. I cannot provide any information on the requirements of NM systems update process save to say that NATS and MOD staff normally attend EUROCONTROL to runs tests once they have completed their work to satisfy our safety assurance processes.

Without completing a full System Impact assessment, which can take weeks in itself, it is not possible to quantify the effort and cost of updating but for a comparison, when the current adaptation was implemented for Mar 21 establishment of TDA597, the cost was approximately £[REDACTED].

In addition, all our LOAs, MATS P2 instructions are also configured for the name provided to us by the CAA to meet the original requirement for Mar 21 (and retained for the subsequent activations). These too would need to be updated and notified to the CAA for review and approval.

Consequently, time and in particular the ability to align to a major AIRAC, for system and EU NM changes is required. Given the next expected activation is in Aug 22 and the next AIRAC is on the 8th of Sep, once again the deadline for amendment has been missed.

For what it's worth, I believe the pragmatic course of action here is to update the systems at the introduction of the permanent change. This, as discussed originally with all parties including the CAA, would negate extra effort and cost for multiple stakeholders against constantly adapting systems (this was the reason we agreed with NM to retain all aspects of adaptation in our systems – by retaining the TDA element in the subsequent SUPs) while we wait the outcome of the permanent change.

I understand this may be require a deviation from ICAO to be filed (?) which might well be the pragmatic approach. I'm afraid I'm not SQEPs in this area but the CAA will be able to guide here I'm sure. Dependant on the CAA direction on this the next opportunity in the AIRAC cycle would be Dec 22 with a Sep 22 submission cut-off date. Although, until the permanent change is approved there is always the risk that any effort is written off if further change is required.

[REDACTED]

Cheers

[REDACTED]

NATS

ATM Development
Military Interface Lead
Airspace & Future Operations

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[\[REDACTED\]@nats.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@nats.co.uk)

www.nats.co.uk



NATS Internal

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 May 2022 11:15
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 20220526-ACP-2021-048 Nomenclature

Thanks for your SME input into the meeting earlier. It was really useful to clarify the regulatory requirement and put it into context with not only this ACP but other ongoing ACPs with MoD sponsors. With regards to TDA EG D597, it is clear that CAA wish to investigate removing the TDA prefix prior to making a decision on future activations. I understand that any change would require changes to systems and publications.

In order for me to provide the information required by CAA, please can you provide a qualitative statement on behalf on NATS describing the cost and time impacts of making this change?

Thanks,

Mike

Sqn Ldr M I Parker MCGI RAF | SO2 A7 Training Enablers | HQ 11 Gp | Air Command | Hurricane Block | RAF High Wycombe | Walters Ash | Bucks | HP14 4UE | Skype: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] | Email: [REDACTED]

I am routinely working from home. Please use e-mail or Skype as the primary methods of contact.

If you are not the intended recipient, please notify our Help Desk at Email.Information.Solutions@nats.co.uk immediately. You should not copy or use this email or attachment(s) for any purpose nor disclose their contents to any other person.

NATS computer systems may be monitored and communications carried on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system.

Please note that neither NATS nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses or any losses caused as a result of viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

NATS means NATS (En Route) plc (company number: 4129273), NATS (Services) Ltd (company number 4129270), NATSNAV Ltd (company number: 4164590) or NATS Ltd (company number 3155567) or NATS Holdings Ltd (company number 4138218). All companies are registered in England and their registered office is at 4000 Parkway, Whiteley, Fareham, Hampshire, PO15 7FL.