

Annexes G2 and G3: FOI 2025.122, AirNav Briefing and IAA Report (13 May 2025)

Source

FOI Reference: TRA-FOI-2025-0122. Decision date: 26 June 2025. Full grant, no redactions. 2 records released.

NOTE: The original released documents (PDFs) need to be copied from: 2025/FOI/FOI request 2025.122/

Overview

On 30 May 2025, a FOI request was submitted to the Department of Transport seeking records relating to oversight of daa, AirNav Ireland, and IAA regarding North Runway compliance with Noise Preferential Routes. Four categories of records were requested covering January 2025 to present.

The Department found only 2 records across all four categories. Both were from the same week in May 2025, both prepared at the last minute for a ministerial meeting with the St Margaret's The Ward Residents Group.

The trigger was an urgent request on 12 May 2025 from Adam Monaghan (Air Navigation Policy, Dept of Transport) to AirNav and IAA because Minister O'Brien was meeting the residents' group and the flight paths issue was on the agenda. Monaghan gave a 24-hour deadline. The Department did not already know the answers to these basic questions, nearly 3 years after the runway opened.

G2: AirNav Ireland Briefing Note (13 May 2025)

From Rachel Martin (AirNav) to Adam Monaghan (Dept of Transport).

Key passages (verbatim):

"Under EU Regulation 139/2014, the daa, as the Aerodrome Operator, holds primary responsibility for ensuring that flight procedures are designed and maintained in line with regulatory requirements."

"AIRNAV Ireland's role is technical and facilitative, rather than regulatory. It ensures that the daa's operational requirements are translated into compliant procedures, but it does not determine the regulatory framework or the core design criteria."

"AIRNAV Ireland remain at the disposal of the daa and the IAA Regulatory Competent Authority to engage in any process of review the flight procedure design at Dublin airport."

AirNav explicitly distances itself from design decisions and puts daa squarely as the entity responsible. "Noise abatement requirements" is listed as a design consideration, confirming noise was supposed to be factored into the design.

G3: IAA Report on Approving Dublin Airport North Runway IFPs (13 May 2025)

From Paul Kennedy, Head of Aviation Infrastructure, IAA. Title: "IAA Role in Approving the Dublin Airport North Runway IFPs" (Version 1.0).

Key passages (verbatim):

Responsibility chain:

"IFPs at an airport, such as arrival and departure flight paths, are the responsibility of the aerodrome operator or, if delegated by the aerodrome operator, the air navigation services provider."

The 30-degree rule:

"To use segregated parallel operations, Regulation (EU) 2017/373 requires that the nominal IFP departure track must diverge immediately after take-off by at least 30 degrees from the missed approach track of the adjacent approach. Conversely the missed approach track can also diverge from the departure track by 30 degrees and meet the requirement."

This is the IAA formally confirming: (a) the 30-degree divergence is a regulatory requirement for the chosen mode of operation; and (b) the missed approach can be the one that diverges, validating the NRTG proposal.

What the IAA checked:

"The IAA, in line with its statutory role, assessed these IFPs which were submitted by AirNav Ireland and, finding that they did comply with safety requirements, approved them."

No mention of checking planning permission compliance, NPR compliance, environmental compliance, or noise abatement compliance. The IAA approved purely on safety/technical grounds.

Alternative Means of Compliance (AltMoC):

"EU Regulations provide for the use of a process known as an Alternative Means of Compliance (AltMoC). This process allows for procedures that do not meet the provisions of EU Regulations to be used, once an equivalence to requirements (safety and technical) can be demonstrated."

"The IAA is aware of a limited number of examples in the EU where an AltMoC has been approved in respect of IFPs for segregated parallel operations which do not diverge by 30 degrees."

Neither daa nor AirNav has submitted an AltMoC proposal.

What FOI 2025.122 Proves

1. The responsibility chain is formally documented: daa is responsible, AirNav facilitates, IAA verifies compliance with minimum safety standards only
2. Neither IAA nor AirNav mandated the current divergent flight paths
3. A regulatory pathway (AltMoC) exists to remove the 30-degree divergence, and it has been done elsewhere in the EU
4. Noise was supposed to be a design consideration but was not applied
5. The Department had zero records of oversight for nearly 3 years

Aarhus Relevance

These documents establish that a known solution to the planning breach exists (AltMoC), that the responsible party (daa) has not pursued it, and that the State exercised zero oversight of the situation. The public was denied participation in the original decision (flight path change) and is now denied any effective mechanism to compel correction. The Department's own records confirm it exercised no proactive oversight of NPR compliance for the entire period from runway opening (August 2022) to May 2025.