



International Civil Aviation Organization

**Third Meeting of the Asia / Pacific ICAO Flight Plan & 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

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL CHALLENGES OF
PROCESSING ICAO FILED FLIGHT PLAN (FPL) AND
REPETITIVE FLIGHT PLAN (RPL)**

(Presented by Singapore)

SUMMARY

This paper highlights the administrative and operational challenges that affect ANS providers (ANSPs) when processing FPLs and RPLs. Measures to address these challenges are beneficial for efficient processing of received FPLs in the light of the impending implementation of amended ICAO flight planning and associated ATS Message provisions.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Conventionally, RPLs are filed for recurring pre-planned flight operations with identical characteristics. However, the availability of improved means of exchanging aeronautical data between ANSPs such as via automated AIM (Aeronautical Information Management) System coupled with an increase in the number of budget airlines operations, have resulted in and / or contributed to several FPLs and RPLs being received simultaneously by the ANSPs.

1.2 Currently, with ANSPs working on hardware and software responses to the new ICAO FPL format, we should also take the opportunity to address the administrative and operational problems faced by ANSPs when processing FPLs and RPLs.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Key problems and their impact

2.1.1 Identical FPLs are received from different sources - Besides receiving FPL from the ATS Reporting Office, identical FPL is also received directly from the airline operator (AO). Additionally, States with automatic flight plan management systems are also sending out RPLs as FPLs based on the filed EOBT. These not only load the communication channels used between the ATS units but also raised the question of which is the acceptable or approved source for FPL.

2.1.2 FPLs for the same flight and its associated ATS update messages are received from different sources and with different contents - ANSPs are faced with the task to match the ATS update messages to the source of the FPL. This not only unnecessarily increases the workload of the ANSPs but also confuses the ANSPs.

2.1.3 The current ICAO RPL format does not have a specific field to specify the communications, navigation and surveillance equipment carried and aircraft capabilities, similar to Item 10 of an FPL - AOs are currently only declaring an abbreviated set in Item O of the ICAO RPL form. Following the new ICAO FPL format, it is imperative to provide a dedicated field in the RPL form to specify the communications, navigation and surveillance equipment carried and aircraft capabilities.

2.1.4 Absence of aircraft registration data from the aerodrome of departure - AOs and flight despatchers are not consistent in following through to update their aircraft registration. This data is essential for ANSPs' administrative and operational processes such as for ADS / CPDLC operations to Airworthiness matters as well as the need for safety monitoring on RVSM and RNP / RNAV operations.

2.1.5 Advance submission of RPL list followed by automatic transmission of RPL as FPL on the day of operations - This increases the number of duplicate flight plans received, thereby increasing the volume and complication in handling FPLs by ANSPs.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) Discuss the measures to curtail the receipt of multiple FPLs filed by various agencies;
- b) Discuss the measures to manage multiple FPLs to ensure reliability of flight data filed; and
- c) Discuss the issue to support the implementation of the Equipment and Capability item in the ICAO RPL form.

.....