



*International Civil Aviation Organization*

**The Third Meeting of the Asia/Pacific ICAO Flight Plan and ATS Messages Implementation Task Force (FPL&AM/TF/3)**

Bangkok, Thailand, 23 – 24 August 2010

---

**Agenda Item 4: Aspects of implementation in Asia/Pacific region**

**AIDC Message Change Considerations**

(Presented by Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America)

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Recent work undertaken by the Informal South Pacific Coordination Group for integration and update to their respective NAM and APAC AIDC Interface Control Documents (ICD) has identified possible changes are required to incorporate contents of Amendment 1 to the PANS ATM for 2012. Results of discussion within this group deemed it was of benefit to bring the subject to the attention of the Asia Pacific ICAO Task Force so that;
  - a. There was a greater general awareness of any issues surrounding AIDC format and content due to the changes, and
  - b. Any future issues that are encountered can be managed in a timely manner that does incur undue delay to documentation/software and operational change.

**2. Discussion**

- 2.1 In regard to AIDC Coordination type message class between ANSPs, several of the fields used are changed by the amendment and will potentially affect the interface. The ICD includes the fields by reference to the PANS-ATM, so while there will be a minimal change to the ICD in this area there are potentially significant impacts to the interfaces. A summary of the relevant changes is as follows:
  - 2.1.1 Items 7, 8, 13, and 16- clarifications and editorial changes that are unlikely to affect the interface.
  - 2.1.2 Item 10- substantive changes to equipment and capabilities field. Any message that includes Item 10 will be affected.
  - 2.1.3 Item 15- change to allow a significant point to be represented by a bearing and distance from a 2-5 character fix.
  - 2.1.4 Item 18- substantive changes that include new indicators (e.g. PBN/) and changes to information associated with an indicator (e.g. DAT/).

- 2.2 The following table identifies field changes required to be cohesive with Amendment 1 to the PANS ATM.

MSG	Decode	Contains Field	Field Affected
ABI	Advanced Boundary Information	3,7,13,14,16,22	22 Includes 15 and optional 10,18
CPL	Current Flight Plan	3,7,8,9,10,13,14,15,16,18	10,15,18
EST	Coordination Estimate	3,7,13,14,16	Nil
MAC	Coordination Cancel	3,7,13,16,22	22 includes 18
PAC	Preactivation	3,7,13,14,16,22	22 optional 10, 15, 18
CDN	Coordination	3,7,13,16,22	22 includes 10, 15,18
ACP	Acceptance	3,7,13,16	Nil
REJ	Rejection	3,7,13,16	Nil
TRU	Track Update	3,7,13,16	Nil

### 3. Date of Flight

- 3.1 As detailed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Asia/Pacific ICAO FPL &AM/TF report, Japan analysed 120 hour submission and the need for DOF for AIDC messages and came to the conclusion that it would not normally be necessary due to the messages being exchanged after the flight had departed.
- 3.2 However, a PAC message, being preactivation before a flight is airborne, may require linking to a flight plan with a DOF element. In this case, PAC could be linked to the correct flight plan via a Field 22 amendment containing Field 18 DOF/.
- 3.3 Another possible exception is when an ABI is received before or when no DEP message has activated the Flight Plan.
- 3.4 States need to be aware of their individual circumstances and system requirements in regard to whether Date Of flight Information needs to be included in appropriate AIDC messages. This can be managed by individual bilateral agreements between States affected.

### 4. Interface Transition

- 4.1 Each AIDC interface during Phase 3 could potentially see a mixture of NEW and PRESENT flight data—at least during test periods and potentially during operations if both sides agree.
- 4.2 It is important that the ANSPs involved in each interface coordinate a plan for testing the interface, and for operations in Phase 3 when some filers can be potentially filing NEW and others PRESENT. It is possible to design systems to maintain operational messages in PRESENT format regardless of what format was filed, or to transmit AIDC messages using the format in which the flight plan was received.
- 4.3 Presence of both NEW and PRESENT flight data on each interface also implies that the receiving system will be able to recognize which format a flight plan is in.

**5. Action by the Meeting:**

1. The meeting is asked to take note of the information in this Paper
2. The meeting is asked to report any findings as a result of discussion from this Paper so that the Special Implementation Project (SIP) on ATS Inter-Facility Data Communication AIDC Implementation Seminar may be informed.

.....