

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 20220805-Level 0 Confirmation ACP-2022-057
Date: 05 August 2022 10:22:09
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Morning [REDACTED],

Thank you for the email below outlining the details of ACP-2022-057: FIR OAT Boundary Waypoint Change and for our telcon to clarify the questions I had.

Scope of Review

To complete my review of this ACP I have considered the following documents and information, along with the detail provided in your email below, against the guidance contained in CAP1616:

 [SoN for ACP-2022-057: FIR OAT Boundary Waypoint Change](#)

Mil AIP entries: [ENR3.5 \(Other Routes\)](#) & [ENR6-1](#)

Civil AIP entries: [ENR6-72](#) & [ENR4.4 \(Name Code Designators for Significant Points\)](#)

Confirmation of Level 0

Having reviewed the documents listed above and the guidance contained in CAP1616 Part 1 under the heading of "Scaling the process by assigning a 'Level' to each change proposal" (paras 77 to 85) and, particularly, the examples of airspace change appropriately categorised as Level 0 detailed in Appendix A, table A2, I confirm that I agree with your assessment that ACP-2022-057 constitutes a Level 0 ACP. As such, I endorse its approval and implementation, appropriately managed by you as the assigned Case Officer.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]
Airspace Regulator (Technical)
Airspace, ATM & Aerodromes
Civil Aviation Authority

[REDACTED] [@caa.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@caa.co.uk)

Tel: [REDACTED]

Follow us on Twitter: [@UK_CAA](#)

Please consider the environment. Think before printing this email.




From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 August 2022 08:05
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: 20220805-Level 0 Confirmation ACP-2022-057

Hi [REDACTED]

I would appreciate your consideration on an ACP to act as the second Tech Reg for a potential Level 0.

BLUF

DAATM have submitted a  [SoN](#) to request x3 non-standard waypoint names to be modified to 5LNCs. The waypoints support cross-border elements of the OAT TACAN Routes and the request is merely to change the names, with no adjustment to locations, tracks or cross-border arrangements, although there will be a need to adjust LoAs to capture the new names. This needs to be achieved no later than 1 Dec 22 (AIS cut-off 2 Sep) in order to meet the requirements of a trial supporting the development of the integrated OAT flight plan system (a SESAR initiative that utilises the same systems as civil flight plans so waypoint naming conventions need to be standard).

DETAIL

The TACAN Routes are defined in the Mil AIP [ENR3.5 \(Other Routes\)](#) and depicted in charts in both the Mil AIP ([ENR6-1](#)) and Civ AIP ([ENR6-72](#)).

The French Mil have asked 78 Sqn to support the amendment of waypoints SPT and ING, with an initial request to use 5ANNC. The UK does not currently support the proliferation of 5ANNC in the en-route environment (pending further workshops with ICAO and ECTL) and we believe that 5LNCs are more appropriate.

On investigation ING is not in the London FIR/UIR so is a matter for 78 Sqn to discuss with the French, but there are a number of other waypoints on the London FIR/UIR boundary that may cause an issue due to the French involvement in the trial. As such, DAATM wish to amend CNO, SPT and EPT to 5LNCs at the earliest opportunity. The CAA has already reserved x3 5LNCs for this work, pending confirmation of the ICAO checks.

Whilst the routes are defined in the Mil AIP, the requirement for a CAA-regulated ACP is due to the need to amend the chart in the Civ AIP and manage the introduction of new 5LNCs (also to be included in the Civ AIP ENR4.4).

This ACP is scoped to just change the names of x3 waypoints; it is believed that they should be boundary crossing points but they do not quite sit on the boundary but this will not be adjusted within this ACP – there are other matters relating to the TACAN Routes that DAATM will review as part of some follow-on work, such as consideration of changing all remaining non-standard waypoints to 5LNCs.

From a CAP1616 perspective I believe that this is a Level 0 ACP as there are no impacts to civil aviation, airspace structures or civil ATS procedures. The TACAN Routes are for OAT and are not changing as a result of this ACP. The addition of new 5LNC in the Civ AIP will not impact on civil operations; there is already an example of a 5LNC on a TACAN Route boundary crossing point that has been utilised for OAT for many years (NAVPI).

I appreciate your input, please let me know if you wish to discuss any of this further.

Regards,

[REDACTED]
Airspace Regulator (Technical)
Airspace, ATM & Aerodromes
Civil Aviation Authority

Tel: [REDACTED]

Follow us on Twitter: [@UK_CAA](#)



Please consider the environment. Think before printing this email.