



*International Civil Aviation Organization*

**Fourth Meeting of the Southeast Asia Route Review Task Force  
(SEA-RR/TF/4)**

Bangkok, Thailand, 22 – 26 November 2010

---

**Agenda Item 6:   ATS Route Development**

**PROPOSED REALIGNMENT OF CURRENT ROUTES L642, M771 AND A1**

(Presented by the Secretariat)

**SUMMARY**

This working paper focuses on the advantages of re-aligning L642, M771 and A1 and suggests a strategy to complete this task during the lifetime of this task force.

**1.    INTRODUCTION**

1.1           The meeting would recall that this subject has been discussed at previous task force meetings however, notwithstanding considerable deliberations and many suggestions, no agreement has been reached.

1.2           It is suggested that further strategies could be developed to move this item forward to take advantage of the use of surveillance and VHF coverage and increase efficiencies by the re-alignment of these important routes.

**2.    DISCUSSION**

2.1           As mentioned previously, by realigning the present RNAV RNP 10 – 50 NM separation routes L642 and M771 to the west of their present positions so that both routes could be considered as RNAV 5 routes under full radar and VHF coverage so that both routes would be capable of RNAV 5 procedures, it may be possible to reduce the lateral spacing between these RNAV routes to an agreed distance of a maximum of 20 NM. In addition this would also allow reducing the longitudinal spacing to a lesser agreed distance than the present required under RNP10 procedures.

2.2           It would likely be necessary to take into consideration the affect of this proposal on ATS route A1 depending on the distance of moving both routes westwards. Nevertheless, in the spirit of strengthening a route structure to increase the present capacity and gain efficiencies by the use of surveillance and VHF communications, it is worthwhile looking at all aspects of this proposal and explore the various opportunities which may be available.

2.3           It is considered that this subject also requires the attention of the Small Working Group to look into all aspects of the long standing proposal.

3. **ACTION BY THE MEETING**

3.1 Using the mechanisms of the small working groups, the meeting is invited to:

- a) continue to study and discuss alternatives in this particular area to capture all possibilities to enhance the route review process;
- b) discuss military requirements or restrictions which may affect some of these proposals and suggest alternative concepts where required;
- c) devise a Task List of work to be achieved;
- d) agree on a Target date for implementation of each phase of this project.

.....