

Gatwick RNAV Substitution ACP Assessment Meeting

ACP-2022-067

14 December 2022

12:00 – 13:00 (Teams)

Attendees

| CAA | | Gatwick Airport | |
|------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name | Role | Name | Role |
| [REDACTED] | Airspace Regulator (Technical) | [REDACTED] | Airspace Change Manager |
| [REDACTED] | Principal Regulator – IFP | [REDACTED] | Lead Technical Consultant (Trax) |
| [REDACTED] | Principal Regulator – IFP | [REDACTED] | IFP Designer (Trax) |
| | | [REDACTED] | Airspace Change Specialist (Trax) |

1. Introduction (Slide 3)

The CAA welcomed the group and read out the CAA's Assessment Meeting Opening Statement:

CAA confirmed that the documents must be published by the sponsor, together with minutes of the meeting, on the Airspace Change Portal page. CAA explained the purpose of the meeting and confirmed that the meeting was an Assessment Meeting and not a Gateway. The CAA reinforced that the sponsor was required to provide a broad description of their proposed approach to meeting the CAA's CAP 1616 requirements, but the CAA was not deciding whether the proposed approach met the detailed requirements of the CAA's process at this stage.

The CAA explained that following acceptance of Gatwick's VOR Impact Assessment, the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the timeline and requirements for this Level 2C RNAV Substitution ACP.

2. Statement of Need (Slide 4)

Gatwick provided an overview the Statement of Need (slide 4).

Post meeting note: The scope this RNAV substitution ACP covers the conventional SIDs, with the exception of the HARDY 5M 5V, and the IAPs without Radar Control.

The VOR Impact assessment established that Gatwick's RNAV1 SIDs are not impacted by VOR rationalisation and no further assessment/modification to the procedures was required within the scope of CAP1781.

3. Timeline (Slide 5)

Gatwick provided an overview of the planned timeline (slide 5) and explained that they would like to split the 5 year review submission into 3 parts. Gatwick added that they had made a number of assumptions (included on slide 5) to inform the timeline and asked the CAA whether these were agreeable.

The CAA agreed that the timeline was achievable although noted that they would need to prioritise work internally. They added that it is helpful to have the IFP submission split into three parts.

Gatwick clarified whether it will be possible to approve the CAP1781 ACP subject to 5 year review approval as shown in the timeline and the CAA confirmed this would be possible.

3. Baseline (Slide 6)

Gatwick raised a question regarding previous regulatory guidance on baseline data and asked for clarification given the Bristol ACP, whilst acknowledging that each airport's circumstances are different.

The CAA explained that the baseline data requirements are being set on an airport by airport basis depending on a number of factors including the track keeping systems available at the airport. In the case of Gatwick, the requirements previously outlined (as shown in slide 6) would be what the CAA requires.

The CAA asked if Gatwick would typically store 12 months of historic NTK data and Gatwick confirmed that this would be available. With regards to format, the CAA confirmed they would require raw track data that could be filtered by airline operator.

The CAA requested the information provided included a nominal centreline track. Gatwick queried whether a baseline heatmap would be more appropriate to understand any difference between the pre and post implementation scenarios given the nominal procedure centreline is not necessarily flown. Gatwick confirm that SID nominal tracks are currently unavailable within its NTK system but can be relatively easily provided alongside track data for the purposes of compliance reporting.

Gatwick queried whether the 12 months of baseline data would be required to be captured following the 5 year review, or whether this could be based on historic data. The CAA confirmed that historic data is acceptable to be used subject to any changes resulting from the 5 year review being understood and accounted for by the CAA.

Gatwick asked what the vertical limit of the baseline data was, given that aircraft at Gatwick are typically vectored following the end of the NPR. The CAA stated the baseline data should reflect up to the vertical limits of the NPR¹ and added that the large amount of vectoring beyond the NPR would not be within the scope of the RNAV substitution ACP.

¹ 3000ft or 4000ft depending on the route and the daytime/night-time period ([eAIP](#) EGKK AD 2.21 NOISE ABATEMENT PROCEDURES)

5. Other activity to remove dependencies on VORs (Slide 7)

Gatwick updated on the SRA withdrawal ACP and said they are still on target for AIRAC 02/2023.

Gatwick also noted that a draft Statement of Need will be submitted shortly for the withdrawal of the HARDY 5M 5V SID. Gatwick added that this is expected to be a Level 0 ACP with only impacts to NERL. The indicative timeline is to run in parallel with the RNAV Substitution process, so looking at a decision by the CAA in March 2023. The only implementation timeline constraint is with the NERL time needed to introduce the DCT and undertake system updates. NERL have informed Gatwick that a system AIRAC will be required. Gatwick have engaged NERL to understand suitable timeframes.

6. Next steps and AOB (Slide 8)

Gatwick gave an overview of the next steps as outlined on slide 8.

The CAA noted the importance of the timescales with the VOR rationalisation project, particularly with regards to the criticality of Ockham VOR, and committed to working with Gatwick to ensure those timescales are met.