

**Eighteenth Meeting of the Cross Polar Trans East Air Traffic Management Providers' Work Group
(CPWG/18)**

(Paris, France, 16-19 December 2014)

Agenda Item 5: Provide Status on CPWG/17 Actions

Russian Emergency Aerodromes Being Withdrawn from the AIP

(Presented by United Airlines)

SUMMARY

The issue of Russian “emergency” aerodrome availability in support of Cross Polar, Russian Trans East, and Trans-Siberian operations has been discussed during previous CPWG meetings. Recently there was a change to the Russian AIP removing several aerodromes from the International AIP, and placed in the Domestic AIP, which is generally not applicable to international airline use.

The airport and approach charts for the airports Mirny (UERR), Norilsk (Alykel) (UOOO), Poliarny (UERP) and Salekhard (USDD) were published in the international Russian AIP (book 1) under “Other Aerodromes of the Russian Federation.” These were shown for information in the Jeppesen standard and tailored manuals as “For Russian Users and Emergency Only.”

We urge the Russian Federation to consider these airports as essential for aviation safety and continue their availability as emergency airports for the international operations over Russia.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Emergency aerodromes are essential to the continued safe flight operations over the Russian Federation. There are a limited number of aerodromes that recently were removed from the Russian AIP, Mirny (UERR), Norilsk (Alykel) (UOOO), Poliarny (UERP) and Salekhard (USDD).
- 1.2 There is not an abundance of emergency aerodromes in the region of the Russian Federation that supports the Cross Polar, Russian Trans-East, and Trans-Siberian route systems. By removing these four airports from the International AIP, there is a concern for the overall safety of these operations.

2. Discussion

- 2.1 United Airlines has operated over 25,000 cross polar flights since 1999 (including the legacy Continental flights prior to and since our 2011 merger). We have not experienced a single in-flight emergency requiring a diversion to any Russian airport within the Siberian region. However, it should also be recognized that having “emergency” aerodromes available is a key aspect of overall flight safety.

- 2.2 The majority of commercial flights are now operated by twin engine aircraft, such as the Boeing 777 and 787, which require, by regulation, emergency airports for either “enroute alternate” designation, or emergency designation.
- 2.3 The removal of these four aerodromes from the Russian AIP (International) will significantly reduce the availability of potential emergency airports supporting the above mentioned route structures.
- 2.4 It is imperative to have published charts and other AIS information for flight crews and Airline Operation Control (dispatch) for these aerodromes.
- 2.5 Other information, such as Aviation weather reports and forecasts (METARS and TAFs) are also essential to aviation safety in the advent of an inflight emergency. This subject (weather availability) has been under discussion for some time and we would also like to see a resolution to this issue.
- 2.6 We would like the Russian Federation to consider our concerns and re-evaluate the availability of these aerodromes for the continued flight safety over the Russian Federation.

3. Action by the Meeting

- 3.1 The meeting is invited to:
 - a. review the information contained in this Working Paper;
 - b. endorse the information provided in this Working paper.