



## MINUTES OF ACP-2024-007 RNAV SUBSTITUTION MANCHESTER AIRPORT ASSESSMENT MEETING HELD VIA MS TEAMS ON MONDAY 20<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2024

Monday 20<sup>th</sup> May 2024

### Distribution list

Attendees (listed below) and once approved redacted version to appear on CAA  
Airspace change portal.

Present	Initials (for Qs)	Appointment	Representing
	MC	Airspace Change Account Manager	CAA
	GS	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	LH	Airspace Regulator (Environment)	CAA
	TS	Airspace Regulator (Engagement and Consultation)	CAA
	JH	Airspace Regulator (Economic)	CAA
	JF	Principal Airspace Regulator representing IFP	CAA
	SM	ATM Inspector	CAA
Observing	EW	Airspace Regulator (Engagement and Consultation)	CAA
	IM	Airspace Regulator (Engagement and Consultation)	CAA
	JD	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
Presenting	CG	Future Airspace Development Specialist	MAG
	JC	Future Airspace Consultation & Technical Liaison Manager	MAG

### CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

CAA noted that a pdf of the slides used at the meeting (that included and agenda) had been presented for consideration in advance of the Assessment Meeting (on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> May 2024) and 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 purpose of the Assessment Meeting (set out in detail in CAP 1616) was broadly:

- for the Sponsor to present and discuss their Statement of Need,
- to enable the CAA to consider whether the proposal concerned falls within the scope of the formal airspace change process, including determining whether the proposal falls within the scope of a pre-scaled ACP process/Level 3,
- to enable the CAA to consider the appropriate provisional Level to assign to the change proposal.

Additionally, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to proceed to fulfil the requirements of the airspace change process and to provide information on timescales. Lastly, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to meet the engagement requirements of the various stages of the airspace change process.



	ACTION
<p><b>Item 1 – Introduction</b></p> <p>Introductions were made and roles established before the PowerPoint presentation commenced (see other materials stored on portal or supplied with these notes for the PowerPoint slides).</p>	
<p><b>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</b></p> <p>Slide 3 - The Statement of Need was considered, and MAG emphasised that the DVOR substitution proposed in ACP-2024-007 was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>An interim solution</b> -Implementation of the Manchester Airport Future Airspace project (FASI) ACP-2019-23 will provide the long-term solution. On implementation ACP-2019-23 will remove dependency on the MCT DVOR/DME by providing Required Navigation Performance (RNP) SIDs and approaches to/from 7,000ft, from/to all four runways (Runway 23R, Runway 23L, Runway 05L and Runway 05R).</li> <li>• <b>An Impact Assessment, in accordance with CAP1781, was submitted in June 2023</b> - The preferred solution, identified for the SID and Initial Approach Procedures, is to utilise 'RNAV substitution', as detailed AIP EGCC 6-1 – 6-6 and EGCC 7 series respectively. 'Substitution' would provide an interim measure with FMS coding provided to aircraft, that would allow airlines to continue flying existing profiles without the ground-based assets.</li> <li>• <b>The Impact Assessment was accepted in January 2024</b> -This ACP is designed to be pursuant of CAP1781 and meet the solutions proposed in the Impact Assessment accepted by the CAA.</li> </ul>	None
<p><b>Item 3 – Impact Assessment Review</b></p> <p>Slides 4 and 5 -Tables from the Impact Assessment showed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eight solutions had been considered for affected procedures for departing aircraft and the only viable option was RNAV Substitution.</li> <li>• Six solutions had been considered for affected procedures for arriving aircraft and the only viable options were RNAV Substitution and amendment of procedures.</li> </ul>	None
<p><b>Item 4 – Proposed solution</b></p> <p>Slides 6-11 Solutions proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>AD2.21 Noise Abatement Procedures</b> -The description of the Noise Preferential Routes (NPR) should be amended to mirror the RNAV substituted SID; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This will provide a far more accurate description of each current NPR specific to each SID and makes it clearer to both flight crew where the NPRs end.</li> <li>○ Will remove any reference to any ground-based navigation aid leaving the SID to description to detail the basis of the NPR.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Chart 3-2</b> -We could remove the Chart but would prefer to retain it as it contains references to the position of Noise Monitoring Terminals used for imposing noise penalties. We propose to simply remove MCT DVOR/DME symbology from chart and references to other Navigational Aids.</li> <li>• <b>Chart 4-1</b> -We propose to remove symbology not relevant to the revised procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ WAL DVOR/DME</li> <li>○ MCT DVOR/DME</li> <li>○ WHI NDB</li> <li>○ LPL NDB</li> <li>○ HAW NDB</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Chart 5-1</b> -We propose to remove symbology not relevant to the revised procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ MCT DVOR/DME</li> <li>○ LPL NDB</li> <li>○ WHI NDB</li> <li>○ MCT R132 &amp; DAYNE</li> <li>○ MCT R119 &amp; AMLET</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	None



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SIDs</b> -We propose to RNAV substitute:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ EKLAD 1R/1Y</li> <li>○ KUXEM 1R/1Y</li> <li>○ ASMIM 1S/1Z</li> <li>○ LISTO 2S/2Z</li> <li>○ LISTO 2R/2Y</li> <li>○ POL 5R/1Y</li> <li>○ POL 4S/1Z</li> <li>○ SONEX 1R/1Y</li> <li>○ DESIG 1S/1Z</li> <li>○ SANBA 1R/1Y</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>IAPs</b> -We propose to RNAV Substitute IAP element of:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ILS/DME (I-MC)</li> <li>○ LOC/DME (I-MC)</li> <li>○ ILS/DME (I-MC)</li> <li>○ LOC/DME (I-MM)</li> <li>○ ILS/DME (I-NN)</li> <li>○ LOC/DME (I-NN)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>IAPs</b> -Remove the procedures:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ILS/DME (MCT) 05R</li> <li>○ VOR/DME 05R</li> <li>○ ILS/DME (MCT) 05L</li> <li>○ VOR/DME 05L</li> <li>○ ILS/DME (MCT) 23R</li> <li>○ VOR/DME 23R</li> <li>○ VOR/DME 23L</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Item 5 – Proposed engagement</b></p> <p>Slides 12 and 13 -It was outlined that Manchester Airport routinely engages with key stakeholders. As the proposed DVOR Substitution process will have no effect on the vertical profile or lateral track of departing aircraft below 7,000ft, the engagement delivered has been and will be audience led:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Explained the background to the ACP and informed that it will not alter the path of aircraft or their height above the ground.</li> <li>○ Advised that progress can be tracked on the portal.</li> <li>○ Invited to raise any questions or concerns with us.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Aviation             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Engaged with airlines to help establish the potential benefits that could be realised by the ACP.</li> <li>○ Contacted Air Traffic Control providers to establish the viability and likely support for the ACP.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Examples of aviation and community stakeholders include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flight Operations Safety Committee (FLOPSC) provides an ongoing two-way dialogue with the air traffic, operations, pilot and ramp communities. Such an interface combined with our ongoing fleet equipage survey, bespoke meetings on particular issues and the routine exchange of e-mails ensures a strong basis with which to engage.</li> <li>• Manchester Airport Consultative Committee meets quarterly and has a Subgroup tasked with environmental/community issues the Technical Advisory Group (TAG). We also meet with Parish/Town/Borough Councillors every six-months and hold routine briefings and information exchanges.</li> </ul>	None



<p>Going forward we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit an engagement strategy that summarises our proposed/completed engagement.</li> <li>• Summarise our completed engagement in the submitted documentation. We will detail feedback from stakeholders to show support or otherwise of our proposal.</li> <li>• We need to establish airlines can fly RNAV substitutions and our Flight Equipage survey has revealed the technical capabilities and navigation systems used by carriers using MAN. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o We currently have data on airlines flying 95% of the 2024 summer schedule.</li> <li>o We are working hard to improve that.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• We will follow up the presentations made to Flight Operators Safety Group (FLOPSC) with an e-mail to operators with the details of the DVOR substitution. Mail will be sent in August giving operators 28 days to reply (total of more than eleven-months since first raised at FLOPSC).</li> <li>• Our colleagues in the Flight Evaluation Team will support our efforts within their own communications and meetings with operators using Manchester Airport.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Item 6 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements*</b></p> <p>Slide 14 -It was explained that for the reasons outlined below, it was clear from the perspective of MAG that ACP-2024-007 was clearly low impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Initial Approach element of the current published approach procedures will be separated out and become IAPs as part of the 5-yearly Periodic Review and be RNAV Substituted.</li> <li>✓ Aircraft are routinely vectored, under radar control, to make an ILS approach to the duty runway. <b>-This will continue unchanged.</b></li> <li>✓ Aircraft fly RNAV Overlay versions of the SIDs and most have done for 10 years+.</li> <li><b>-This will continue unchanged.</b></li> <li>✓ <b>No change</b> to any lateral track or vertical profile flown as a result of this ACP.</li> <li>✓ <b>No change</b> to this ACP as a result of the approval/implementation of ACP-2024-002.</li> <li>✓ The MCT DVOR will be withdrawn 1<sup>st</sup> January 2026, leaving no alternative but DVOR Substitution in the time left..</li> </ul> <p>In the absence of a lower even less stringent categorised the ACP should be regarded as a Level 3 change.</p> <p><i>* When the sponsor submits their gateway materials for each Gateway at the agreed submission deadline, the period between this and the gateway decision will be an analysis by the CAA Airspace Regulatory team (Airspace Regulation) of the documentation submitted, for the purposes of making a recommendation to the CAA Gateway decision maker(s). In conducting the gateway assessment, the CAA is assessing the process employed and its compliance with the guidance stipulated within CAP 1616. It is not an assessment of the merits of the submission itself, which is reviewed at Stage 5 - Decision. We may request documentation from the sponsor that is referred to in the gateway submission but has not been provided as part of the Gateway submission materials. We may also request the sponsor to provide information by way of clarification relating to statements or assumptions made in the submission. Any further information sought by Airspace Regulation at this stage is for clarificatory purposes and is only for determining compliance with the CAP 1616 process.</i></p> <p><i>In any instance where a sponsor has not met the requirements of the process, we will inform them after the gateway decision and advise of next steps.</i></p> <p><i>Please note that this text does not apply to airspace change proposals involving the sole implementation of RNP Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) without an Approach Control, as Gateway Assessments are not required. Therefore, this text can be removed from the Assessment Meeting minutes.</i></p>	None
<p><b>Item 7 – Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)</b></p> <p>Slide 15 - CAP1616f paragraph 3.68 states ‘a Habitat Regulations Assessment is required for airspace change proposals which are likely to have a significant effect – either or alone or in combination with other plans or projects – on European sites.’</p> <p>CAP1616i Paragraph 2.15 refers the change sponsor of a Level 3 change to follow the requirements detailed in CAP1616h. CAP1616h B12 requires the change sponsor to complete the habitats regulations assessment early screening criteria form as contained in CAP1616i.</p>	None



<p>CAP1616h B12 states 'No further habitats regulations assessment will be required if the change sponsor can reasonably demonstrate that their airspace change proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on a European site'. CAP1616i paragraph 9.10 outlines the Early Screening Criteria which comprises three questions outlined on Slide 15.</p> <p>Given the nature of this proposal and the fact that it will have no effect on the vertical profile or lateral track of traffic arriving at or departing from Manchester Airport a Habitats Regulations Assessment is not required.</p>			
<p><b>Item 8 – Safety &amp; Compliance work</b></p> <p>Slide 16 -To meet the requirements outlined in CAP1781b we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct one or more Hazard ID meetings.</li> <li>• Write up in accordance with the ANSPs SMS.</li> <li>• Meet the requirements (goals and sub-goals) required by CAP1781b.</li> <li>• Radar monitoring will commence one month before 'O' date and continue for 12 months thereafter (routine ANOMS capture).</li> </ul>			None
<p><b>Item 9 – Proposed timescales</b></p> <p>Slide 17 -It was outlined that these works need to be completed well before the end of 2025 when the MCT VOR/DME is withdrawn from service. ACP-2024-002 Contingency RNP Approaches already has a timeline to meet implementation in June 2025. It seems logical to implement ACP-2024-007 at or before this date. We there proposed a timeline that would achieve implementation by June 2025.</p> <p>We will submit a formal proposal, post meeting (and achieving Level), through the usual CAA approval processes.</p>			Review and update as required
<p><b>Item 10 – Next Steps, Questions and AOB</b></p>			
Raised or replied by	Question, Answer or Recommendation		
GS	Q	Please clarify the use of the DME for the VOR/DME Approaches?	
CG	A	The ILS/DME and LOC/DME procedures all publish the MCT as an alternate DME should the DME of the ILS be unserviceable for any reason. The removal of the MCT DME as an alternate aid will reduce the contingency element and make the requirement for alternative RNP procedures all the more important.	
TS	Q	Could you confirm that the 28-days described is your main formal engagement -in addition to the other measures that you described? Also Please confirm that you will be contacting the stakeholders required by CAP1781 -including the Members of the National Air Traffic Management Advisory Committee (NATMAC).	
	R	You are welcome to share your engagement Strategy for review before you commence formal engagement. You should share your rationale for a 28-day engagement within this Strategy.	
JC/CG	A	We can confirm that 28-days will be our formal engagement and additional to the other positive measures we have completed this far and that we intend to continue to pursue. Can confirm our list will include NATMAC Members in addition to the other aviation local stakeholders identified and summarised. We will supply a proposed strategy for review/comment within the next month. We will explain our rationale for 28 days in the Strategy and submitted ACP.	



GS	R	The proposed DVOR substitution aligns to the provisions of CAP1781. I would therefore propose ACP-2024-007 should be pursued as a Level 3 change according to CAP1616 V5. Can other Members confirm or cite any concerns.	
JF	R	I am content that the slides presented align to the Impact Assessment submitted in 2023 and the process outlined is compliant.	
LH	R	Happy with the HRA and that the process has been followed to rule out the need of further work at this early stage.	
SM	R	Content.	
JH	R	Content.	
GS	R	We are therefore in agreement that ACP-2024-007 should be pursued as a Level 3 change according to CAP1616 V5	



**ACTIONS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF ACP-2024-007 RNAV SUBSTITUTION  
MANCHESTER AIRPORT ASSESSMENT MEETING MONDAY 20<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2024**

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Notes of meeting	JC	Provide notes of meeting within 7-days of meeting for CAA approval.	27/05/2024
PowerPoint presentation presented	JC	Provide amended (in the light of changes suggested/required by CAA) with notes of meeting within 7-days of meeting for CAA oversight.	27/05/2024
Notes of meeting and PowerPoint presentation	MC	Provide feedback and/or approval of meeting notes/changed PowerPoint Presentation.	Within 7 days of above
Agreed notes/pptx	CC	Once agreed redacted meeting notes and redacted pptx slides uploaded on to portal.	Within 7 days of above.
Engagement Strategy	JC	To share Engagement Strategy for ACP-2024-007	05/07/2024

MAG -Manchester Airport  
ACP Sponsor