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1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 The Twenty-eighth Meeting of the ICAO Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum Implementation Task Force (RVSM/TF/28) – Review of Flight Level Orientation Schemes (FLOS) was held at the Kotaite Wing of the ICAO Asia and Pacific Office, Bangkok, Thailand from 24 to 28 April 2006.

1.1.2 The Terms of Reference for the Task Force are as follows:

- To develop strategic, benefits-driven implementation plans (based on cost benefit studies), in concert with airspace users, for RVSM operations within selected areas and airspace of the Asia/Pacific Region, ensuring inter-regional harmonization;
- To consider any amendments to RVSM guidance material that may be proposed by States and international organizations;
- To address any other matters as appropriate and relevant to the implementation of RVSM;
- The Task Force will include participation from States and International Organizations that are considering or involved with the implementation of RVSM; and
- The Task Force will report to the ATS/AIS/SAR Sub-Group.

(Adopted by the 10th Meeting of the ATS/AIS/SAR Sub-group, 2000)

1.2 Attendance

1.2.1 The meeting was attended by 42 participants from Brunei Darussalam, China, Hong Kong China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam, IATA, IFALPA and IFATCA. A complete list of participants is at Appendix A.

1.3 Officer and Secretariat

1.3.1 Mr. Kuah Kong Beng, Chief Air Traffic Control Officer, Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore, served as Chairperson of the Task Force. Mr. Kyotaro Harano, Regional Officer ATM served as the Secretary for the meeting.

1.4 Opening of the Meeting

1.4.1 Mr. Kuah Kong Beng welcomed the participants and opened the 28th Meeting of the ICAO RVSM Implementation Task Force. He said that the implementation of RVSM operations in the South China Sea area in 2002 had reaped benefits for the air navigation service providers and the users. The flight level allocation scheme (FLAS) had enhanced safety and increased efficiency as well as airspace capacity with significant reduction in ground delays at major airports. The successful implementation of RVSM operations was the result of the excellent cooperation and coordination among the States, ICAO, IATA, IFALPA and IFATCA. He hoped that the same camaraderie spirit would continue to be displayed as all concerned review the FLAS for the South China Sea area.

1.4.2 Mr. Kyotaro Harano, on behalf of Mr. Lalit Shah, Regional Director of the ICAO Asia and Pacific Office, welcomed the participants. He highlighted that the purpose of this meeting
was to review operational issues relating to the modified single alternate FLOS that had been implemented for the Western Pacific/South China Sea (WPAC/SCS) area since 2002. The modified single alternate FLOS was adopted to cater for the crisscrossing traffic movements in the area. However, as a result of the different FLOS implemented in the areas north of the Himalayas and over the Bay of Bengal and beyond (Bay of Bengal and Beyond) area in 2003, there was a need for aircraft to be transitioned from one FLOS to another. Mr. Harano mentioned that the modified single alternate FLOS had resulted in enhancements to the safety, efficiency and regularity of operations in the WPAC/SCS area. However, due to the transition requirements, some States had proposed to change the FLOS for the WPAC/SCS area. In this context, all concerned were urged to work together to review related issues and ensure that any recommendation for change would enable air traffic service providers to continue to apply safe RVSM. He wished good outcomes from the meeting.

1.5 Documentation and Working Language

1.5.1 The working language of the meeting as well as all documentation was in English.

1.5.2 Thirteen Working Papers and five Information Papers were presented to the meeting. A list of papers is included at Appendix B to this Report.
Agenda Item 1: Adoption of Agenda

1.1 The meeting reviewed the provisional agenda and adopted for the meeting. The agenda is at Appendix C to the Report.

Agenda Item 2: Operational Considerations

Review of RVSM/TF/22 and the Special ATS Coordination Meeting to Finalize Arrangements for RVSM/TF Review of the WPAC/SCS FLOS (SCM RVSM FLOS)

2.1 The meeting recalled that RVSM/TF22 (September 2004, Bangkok) was requested by RVSM/TF/20 (October 2003, Delhi), which had decided to go ahead with the RVSM implementation in the Bay of Bengal and Beyond area on 27 November 2003, to review the FLOS for WPAC/SCS area. The meeting was informed that SCM RVSM FLOS (September 2005, Bangkok) was held to progress the review of the flight level assignment and prepare for the RVSM FLOS Review meeting.

RVSM/TF/22

2.2 The meeting recalled that RVSM/TF/22 reviewed the basic principles which had been adopted for the implementation of RVSM in the WPAC/SCS area. Being unable to attend RVSM/TF/22, the Philippines had submitted a detailed proposal on changes to the flight level assignment for No-pre-departure Coordination (No-PDC) flight levels in the WPAC/SCS area. This would allow for better match of the levels in the Bay of Bengal and Beyond RVSM airspace where a single alternate FLOS would be adopted.

2.3 For the purpose of the Philippine’s study and presentation of the proposal, ATS routes in the WPAC/SCS area were categorized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Routes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Parallel routes (uni-directional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Routes crossing the parallels (bi-directional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Routes not crossing the parallels but crossing Class II routes (bi-directional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Routes not crossing the parallels or Class II routes (bi-directional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 RVSM/TF/22 recognized the considerable effort made by the Philippines and additional work completed by Thailand to develop this proposal and agreed that it would be a suitable basis for consideration. RVSM/TF/22 reviewed the Philippine and Thailand proposals for flight level assignment in detail, taking into account comments from States and international organizations. Recognizing the need to maintain safety, efficiency and regularity of operations in the WPAC/SCS area, RVSM/TF/22 developed a provisional revised plan for the flight level assignment and corresponding No-PDC procedures. The proposed flight level assignment and No-PDC levels for each route category as agreed to by RVSM/TF/22 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Both ways: FL 310, FL 320, FL 350, FL 360, FL 390 and FL 400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Eastbound: FL 290, FL 330, FL 370 and FL 410  Westbound: FL 280, FL 300, FL 340 and FL 380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 The proposed assignment of flight levels for the large scale weather deviations (LSWD) on the parallel routes agreed to by RVSM/TF/22 was as follows:

Northbound: FL 310, FL 350 and FL 390  
Southbound: FL 320, FL 360 and FL 400

2.6 The FLAS developed by RVSM/TF/22 are depicted in Appendix D to this Report.

2.7 RVSM/TF/22 emphasized that in accordance with ICAO’s safety management provisions in Annex 11 – Air Traffic Services, detailed safety assessments would need to be carried out by the States concerned. Also, the Monitoring Agency for Asia Region (MAAR) would be required to undertake a safety assessment of the proposed FLAS for RVSM operations.

SCM RVSM FLOS

2.8 The meeting recognized that MAAR provided SCM RVSM FLOS with three scenarios for the FLAS review as follows:

a) Base Case: Current FLAS in WPAC/SCS;  
b) Scenario 1: FLAS change proposed at RVSM/TF/22; and  
c) Scenario 2: Scenario 1 with minor FLAS change on A1 and P901.

2.9 The meeting was informed that Scenario 2 was essentially the same as Scenario 1 but with minor FLAS change on A1 and P901. In order to eliminate existing transition issues while achieving acceptable capacity and risk level on A1 and P901, the following FLAS on these particular routes had been proposed by MAAR for further consideration by the Task Force:

a) Classes I, II and III: same as in Scenario 1  
b) Class IV: Eastbound: FL 290, FL 310, FL 330, FL 370 and FL 410  
   Westbound: FL 300, FL 340, FL 380 and FL 400.

2.10 MAAR clarified to the meeting that in Scenario 2, two flight levels were taken out for each direction of flight-to accommodate flights on crossing routes to A1 and P901 in a State. It was noted that the decision on flight levels to be removed could be left to States concerned.

2.11 At SCM RVSM FLOS, the Chairman of RVSM/TF noted that not all the States concerned were present at RVSM/TF/22 which developed Scenario 1. In light of this, the Regional Office had agreed to advise States by State Letter of the different scenarios and to request that States complete required safety study and simulation of the scenarios as soon as possible in preparation for RVSM/TF/28.

2.12 The meeting recognized the effort of RVSM/TF/22 in developing the FLAS scenarios in an attempt to reduce transition tasks and harmonize the flow of RVSM traffic between the SCS area and the Bay of Bengal and Beyond area as well as the Pacific area.
2.13 With regard to the review of RVSM/TF/22 and SCM RVSM FLOS, IFATCA expressed serious concerns over the safety issue in relation to controllers’ workload brought upon by the task of transition from one FLAS to another and strongly urged the meeting to take the necessary measures to alleviate this predicament.

**Study on Base Case and Scenario 1 for the Singapore FIR**

2.14 Singapore informed the meeting that a simulation had been only conducted on the proposed FLAS based on Scenario 1 to assess the impact on safety, capacity and efficiency as the proposed FLAS in Scenario 2 was similar to Scenario 1 except for the modifications in the FLAS on the ATS routes A1 and P901 which were well outside the Singapore FIR.

2.15 Singapore provided the meeting with the assessments on the Base Case and proposed FLAS based on Scenario 1 as follows:

   a) Safety
   
   The current and proposed FLAS based on Scenario 1 would provide at least 1,000 ft vertical separation at the intersections between the crossing and parallel routes. The flight levels allocated in the current FLAS would be easily remembered as even flight levels were used for the parallel routes and odd flight levels were used on the crossing routes. In the proposed Scenario 1 FLAS, there would be a mixture of even and odd flight levels allocated for the various route categories. As such, there could be a higher risk of human factor error.

   b) Capacity
   
   As the number of flight levels available for air traffic utilisation in the current and proposed Scenario 1 FLAS would be the same, there would not be any impact on the airspace capacity.

   c) Efficiency
   
   The flight levels allocated to the crossing routes were different from those allocated on the parallel routes in the proposed Scenario 1 FLAS. The same numbers of No-PDC flight levels would be made available for both the crossing and parallel routes in the current and proposed Scenario 1 FLAS, hence there would not an increase in ground delays. In the current FLAS, the flight levels allocated to the parallel routes were at 2,000 ft intervals whereas the flight levels allocated on the proposed Scenario 1 FLAS would be at either 1,000 ft or 3,000 ft intervals. As such, there could be an impact on the operating efficiency as aircraft might not be able to operate at or close to optimum flight level.

   d) Transition/Workload
   
   In the current FLAS, transition to the single alternate FLOS would have to be effected on three out of the six parallel routes as well as the westbound flights on the crossing routes whereas in the proposed Scenario 1 FLAS, transition would be effected for aircraft operating on three flight levels on all six parallel routes. Transition within radar coverage would be effected for aircraft operating between the Singapore and Kuala Lumpur FIRs for both the current and the proposed Scenario 1 FLAS.
2.16 Malaysia echoed that transitions in the Kuala Lumpur FIR were effected within radar cover and there were no difficulties encountered.

2.17 The meeting was informed that although Singapore had no objection to the adoption of the proposed Scenario 1 FLAS, the rationale for the adoption should consider safety, capacity, efficiency and controller’s workload.

2.18 Hong Kong, China expressed concern on the transition tasks of any kind. With the anticipated increase of traffic, the transition task would increase the workload on air traffic controllers whether the task was carried out in radar cover or not.

2.19 The Philippines reported to the meeting that the proposed FLAS would require all the aircraft operating on even levels bound for Northeast Asia to be transitioned to the single alternate FLOS.

2.20 IFATCA expressed that any transition activities increase safety and efficiency issue. When transition is required, controllers’ workload would increase. Sometimes, this would lead to the air traffic flow regulations, thus limiting the level of airspace capacity.

2.21 Thailand expressed that more flight levels should be available to the routes other than those of Class I. With regard to the capacity in Paragraph 2.15 b) above, which reported that either FLAS had the same number of flight levels available for traffic utilisation, Thailand noted the new FLAS would increase route capacity in the adjacent FIR. With regard to the capacity of the crossing routes, IATA suggested that parallel routes be established for crossing routes as these routes would increase the number of flight levels available.

2.22 Responding to the establishment of the parallel routes suggested by IATA, Thailand supported the view in the long run; however the establishment of the parallel routes for the crossing routes was not an immediate solution to the problem and would not address the transition issue.

2.23 Singapore informed the meeting that all RVSM flight levels were currently available for flights operating between the Singapore and Jakarta FIRs on four routes and such routes would be considered as Class IV routes.

2.24 IATA informed the meeting that flight levels allocated on the parallel routes in the proposed FLAS did not take into account operational requirements of ultra-long haul aircraft.

**Revised FLAS Based on Modified Single Alternate FLOS**

2.25 Thailand was of view that the transition issue had significant impact on existing RVSM operations and also affects the controller’s mind-set which could cause human error easily. Several States that deal with transition issue were looking forward to the improvement of situation. Thailand reported that the new FLAS would also expand the RVSM benefit in the wider scale with more flexibility to the overall ATM enhancement in this area.

2.26 The meeting was informed that the adoption of the new FLAS in the present modified single alternate FLOS was aimed for the following objectives.

   a) Minimized transition activities and reduced operational workload as well as optimum flight profile.

   b) Harmonized and standardized RVSM application with the neighboring RVSM areas.
c) To alleviate congestion on international traffic flow where flight levels assignment being limited with CVSM cruising table.

d) Improve traffic flow within domestic route network of each FIR, especially FIRs where transition task being carried out.

2.27 In light of the foregoing, Thailand summarized the FLAS developed by RVSM/TF/22 as follows:

a) FLAS for the parallel routes L642, M771, N892, L625, N884 and M767

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present FLA</th>
<th>New FLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FL300, FL320</td>
<td>FL310, FL320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL340, FL360</td>
<td>FL350, FL360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL380, FL400</td>
<td>FL390, FL400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) FLAS for the crossing routes L628, M768, M765, A583, A461, N891 and M758

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present FLA</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>New FLA</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FL290</td>
<td>FL280</td>
<td></td>
<td>FL290</td>
<td>FL280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL330</td>
<td>FL310</td>
<td></td>
<td>FL330</td>
<td>FL300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL370</td>
<td>FL350</td>
<td></td>
<td>FL370</td>
<td>FL340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL410</td>
<td>FL390</td>
<td></td>
<td>FL410</td>
<td>FL380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present FLA</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>New FLA</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FL290</td>
<td>FL280</td>
<td></td>
<td>FL290</td>
<td>FL280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL330</td>
<td>FL310</td>
<td></td>
<td>FL310</td>
<td>FL300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL370</td>
<td>FL350</td>
<td></td>
<td>FL330</td>
<td>FL340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL410</td>
<td>FL390</td>
<td></td>
<td>FL370</td>
<td>FL380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL410</td>
<td>FL400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.28 Transition areas in the Bangkok, Manila and Vientiane FIR were identified by Thailand as in Appendix E to this Report. Thailand reported to the meeting that some of the transition problems could be resolved with the new FLAS.

2.29 No-PDC arrangement and coordination procedure would be required for more flexible use of all flight level assignment on all routes categories.

2.30 Thailand informed the meeting that under the current FLAS, transition would be required for all westbound flights operating on A1 and P901 due to the implementation of single alternate FLOS in the Bangkok FIR. Although the transitions were effected within radar cover, these increased controller’s workload. Hence, the proposed FLAS would reduce controller’s workload as transition would be minimised.

2.31 IATA highlighted that the proposed FLAS would raise the following issues which would need to be addressed:
a) Hong Kong – Jakarta crossing routes;
b) The use of odd/even flight levels on the parallel routes which would add complexity; and
c) The possibility of an adjacent flight level not being available for transition purposes on the six parallel routes.

**RVSM Implementation within the Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh FIRs**

2.32 Viet Nam reported that Civil Aviation Administration of Viet Nam (CAAV) had developed a comprehensive plan for the RVSM implementation within the Ho Chi Minh and Ha Noi FIRs.

**Implementation Status**

2.33 Viet Nam reported that the implementation of RVSM within the Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh FIRs had been carried out in a phased manner.

2.34 In the phase 1, the flight level spectrum was FL 310 – FL 410. The meeting noted that an RVSM-CVSM transition area had been established in the Ho Chi Minh FIR on routes L642 and M771 between Ho Chi Minh ACC and Sanya ACC.

2.35 In the phase 2, in addition to the phase 1, the flight level spectrum was expanded to FL 290 – FL 410. The meeting was informed that FLOS on ATS domestic routes W1 and W2 (main trunk routes between Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh City) was the single alternate with FL 290, FL 310, FL 330, FL 350, FL 370, FL 390 and FL 410 for the northbound, and FL 300, FL 320, FL 340, FL 360, FL 380 and FL 400 for the southbound.

2.36 The meeting noted that traffic volume on the above ATS routes was expected to increase. With the RVSM implementation, there had been a greater number of flight levels used in the area. The meeting recognized that the current FLOS accommodated the traffic volume on each ATS/RNAV route and most of the traffic had been cleared to fly at an optimum flight level. The delays had been reduced. Separations have been established strategically at crossing points, thus enhancing flight safety as well as reducing ATC coordination and ATC workload.

2.37 The meeting was informed that the RVSM procedures were successfully implemented within the FIRs during the phases 1 and 2, and subsequent operations were being smooth. The most traffic (96%) was being operated in RVSM level spectrum and the remaining (4%) was being operated at lower levels because of not meeting RVSM or RNP 10 requirements.

2.38 The meeting also noted that there were many operational advantages for ATC provision within the Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh FIRs with the current RVSM FLOS. It was recognized that the significant overall improvement in operations and air traffic management over the area had been achieved as a result of the RVSM introduction.

2.39 On the other hand, it was noted that there were some issues over the areas as follows:

a) Complexity of FLOS between the single and the modified single alternate FLOS in the area.

b) Differences of the FLOS in the WPAC/SCS/Bay of Bengal and Beyond areas.

c) A number of RVSM-CRVM transition areas in certain FIRs in the area (There are also a number of Feet system/Metric system transition areas).
d) Other issues such as the LSWD procedure activation, safety monitoring/assessment, etc.

**Proposed Changes to FLAS**

2.40 Viet Nam supported the efforts made by States concerned and the Regional Office for the proposed changes to the current FLAS and expressed that Scenario 2 FLAS would be more preferable. Modifications were suggested for No-PDC levels. The details of the proposed FLAS as in Appendix F to this Report were presented to the meeting for consideration and discussion.

**Revised FLAS Based on Single Alternate FLOS by the Philippines**

2.41 The Philippines reported that the Manila FIR was bounded in the north and the east by FIRs implementing the single alternate FLOS. Also, typhoon would occur for almost half of the year in the Manila FIR.

2.42 The Philippines had studied the Scenario 2 FLAS and their findings were as follows:

a. **Transition**

   All eastbound flights operating at even flight levels entering the Fukuoka and Taipei FIRs would be in conflict with westbound flights from these FIRs operating at even flight levels, thus requiring flight level changes.

b. **Crossing Tracks**

   Built-in separation would be provided on crossing tracks using limited flight levels.

c. **Deviations**

   With deviating flights operating at the same flight levels from a parallel route, safety would not be ensured.

2.43 In view of the above, the Philippines proposed a new FLAS which would establish a quadrant separation utilizing different flight levels allocated to the northwest-, southwest-, northeast- and southeast-bound flights respectively, hence no transition would be required since odd flight levels would be used for the flights operating on the uni-directional parallel routes from the Singapore FIR to the Fukuoka and Taipei FIRs and even flight levels for the opposite flights operating on the uni-directional parallel routes.

2.44 IATA noted that the FL 290, FL 330, FL 370 and FL 410 would be assigned to the northeast-bound, and FL 280, FL 320, FL 360 and FL 400 to the southwest-bound on the six trunk routes with the Philippine’s proposal. If these flight levels could be used regardless of the direction on the unidirectional six parallel routes, the airspace capacity would be increased. The Philippines responded that the quadrant level assignment was to avoid the traffic coming from the Fukuoka and Taipei FIRs and all the assigned flight levels could not be allocated to the trunk routes. IATA was of view that with 4,000 ft separation within the unidirectional route, efficiency and capacity would be significantly affected.

2.45 The meeting recognized that the Philippines had some difficulties in carrying out the transition with the Scenario 1 FLAS. The meeting also noted that the Philippines would prefer to continue with the current FLAS if the revised Philippines’ proposal was not considered by the RVSM/TF because of the further need for safety study and simulation by the States. Although the
RVSM/TF had been tasked to consider the adoption of the FLAS as proposed by the Philippines and Thailand at RVSM/TF/22, it would not be fruitful to continue discussions on the proposed FLAS.

**Overview on the Proposed Change to the Current SCS FLAS by IATA**

**SCS FLOS**

2.46 IATA reported that the Special ATS Coordination Meeting on Transition Procedures (SCM/Transition, September 2003) recognized that some States had expressed concerns over possible transition problems when RVSM was implemented in the Bay of Bengal and Beyond area on 27 November 2003 using the single alternate FLOS, as the SCS area used the modified single alternate FLOS.

2.47 The meeting recalled that MAAR provided RVSM/TF/22 with an update of reported Large Height Deviations (LHD) occurrences in the RVSM airspaces. The most common contributing factor to the LHD in the WPAC/SCS airspace were the “Error in the ATC-unit to ATC-unit transition message (Category M)”, followed by the “Negative transfer received from the transitioning ATC-unit (Category N)”.

**A1/P901**

2.48 In relation to A1 and P901, IATA noted that MAAR had provided the rationale to delete two flight levels for each direction.

2.49 MAAR confirmed that the four flight levels were taken out to accommodate traffic crossing the Class IV routes. As a result, the passing frequency was reduced due to that change in flight level allocation. In addition, MAAR advised the meeting that the capacity under the new FLAS would be increased compared to the current FLAS as there would be nine flight levels. This would be an increase of two flight levels in addition to the seven flight levels under the current FLAS.

2.50 IATA recognized the evolution of change that would be required in a dynamic aviation environment. IATA supported the change that would provide greater safety, efficiency and regularity in air traffic flow in the airspace of the region. IATA requested that any change in the FLAS over the SCS area be very carefully thought through and planned, to ensure that the significant benefits in the current arrangements would not be diminished.

2.51 On the issue of improving the capacity on the routes A1 and P901, Hong Kong, China informed the meeting that even though the total number of movements of 100 to 110 flights might not seem to be very significant, the fact that these flights were concentrated on a particular period of the day which had raised concerns for the need to increase the capacity of these routes. The meeting was informed that China was considering the possibility to re-position the danger areas as well as re-aligning the two routes into one in the near future.

2.52 As an alternate means of increasing the capacity and to reduce the passing frequencies on these routes, IATA suggested that the routes be kept parallel and unidirectional. China agreed to take this idea back to their headquarters for considerations.

2.53 IFATCA also raised the transitioning workload issue and advised the meeting that the FLAS to be utilized should be error tolerant and should not require controller’s intervention to de-conflict the traffic.

2.54 Hong Kong, China informed the meeting that at present they were relying on the neighboring FIRs to perform the transitioning task but there was no guarantee on the length of time that the adjacent FIRs would continue their supports. At some point in time when the transitioning
became unfeasible, they might be forced to impose a measure to limit the number of aircraft entering the FIR, thus constraining route capacity. Hong Kong, China strongly urged the meeting to consider this matter seriously.

2.55 The meeting noted Hong Kong, China’s concern on the transition issue and agreed to take a few steps back to view a bigger picture of RVSM structure in the region and how the difference in the FLAS could affect the overall system.

**FLAS in the Fukuoka FIR**

2.56 Japan reported to the meeting that RVSM was implemented in the oceanic airspace of the former Tokyo and Naha FIRs (Fukuoka FIR as of 16 February 2006) in February 2001, and subsequently implemented in the domestic airspace at 1900 UTC on 29 September 2005 in conjunction with the implementation in the Incheon FIR of the Republic of Korea.

2.57 ATC specialists present at an IFATCA meeting confirmed their common understanding that the use of the single alternate FLOS would be most preferable for ATC operations at Hong Kong, Manila, Naha and Taipei ACCs when RVSM was implemented in the Naha FIR on 29 September 2005. RVSM/TF/28 recognized that Hong Kong ACC could not apply a single alternate FLOS due to complicated traffic flows within the Hong Kong FIR. Therefore, Taipei ACC was required to undertake transition of the altitude for westbound flights to the current FLAS in the Taipei FIR. Consequently, Taipei ACC requested Naha ACC to undertake transition activities for the westbound flights on G581.

2.58 The meeting was informed that Naha ACC requested Taipei ACC in November 2005 to modify the FLAS on G581 to be aligned with the single alternate FLOS. However, the segment of “G581 HCN G86 –” remained unchanged due to the transition for Hong Kong ACC.

**Changes of FLAS on G581**

2.59 The meeting noted that FLAS for G581 after 16 March 2006 was as follows:

For westbound:  
- G581 HCN G86/B348 FL 310, FL 350 and FL 390
- G581 HCN N892 FL 300, FL 320, FL 340, FL 360, FL 380 and FL 400
- G581 HCN G581 FL 320, FL 360 and FL 400

For eastbound:  
- FL 290, FL 330, FL 370 and FL 410

2.60 The meeting recognized that ATS for the westbound flights on G581 via IGURU had been expected to become smooth and efficient after 16 March 2006. The flights via G581 HCN N892 did not have a problem because no transition was required. On the other hand, it was noted that transition was still required for the flights via G581 HCN G86, and the transition problems remained unresolved.

2.61 It was further noted that a few westbound aircraft would be compelled to fly below FL 280 due to the limited three usable flight levels, i.e. FL 310, FL 350 and FL 390 against inbound FL 300, FL 320, FL 340, FL 360, FL 380 and FL 400. In order to streamline the traffic flow and increase the capacity and efficiency on G581, Japan considered it essential to modify FLAS on G581 to allow for all the levels available in line with the single alternate FLOS, and subsequently to revise the recently agreed FLAS in the letter of agreement between Naha and Taipei ACCs.
The meeting noted the bottleneck problem for the westbound flights via G581 HCN G86. This problem could be resolved when FLAS in the SCS area was reviewed.

**Agenda Item 3: Review proposed change to level allocation developed by the RVSM/TF/22 meeting**

3.1 States and international organizations present provided their views as below on the current RVSM FLAS, Scenarios 1 FLAS proposed by the Philippines and Thailand at RVSM/TF/22, and Scenario 2 FLAS suggested by MAAR.

**China**

3.2 China supported Scenario 2 as it would increase capacity and efficiency on A1 and P901. In addition, China informed the meeting that RVSM introduction to China was being considered, however the definitive plan was not finalized yet.

**Hong Kong, China**

3.3 Hong Kong, China expressed their support of Scenario 2 as there would be no impact on efficiency and would minimize transition activities to further enhance safety. It was also expected that Scenario 2 would increase capacity.

**Japan**

3.4 Japan reported to the meeting that flight levels available to the westbound flight on ATS route G86 was not enough, thus supporting Scenario 2.

**Lao PDR**

3.5 Lao PDR reported that the transition task on A1 in the Vientiane FIR was carried out by Thailand. Lao PDR supported Scenario 2.

**Malaysia**

3.6 Malaysia informed the meeting that the current FLAS had brought benefits to flights operating in the Kinabalu and Kuala Lumpur FIRs. However, Malaysia was open to either option.

**Philippines**

3.7 The Philippines, who had proposed Scenario 1 FLAS at RVSM/TF/22, reported to the meeting that they had reviewed it and decided to withdraw their FLAS proposal. The Philippines was against changing the FLAS.

**Singapore**

3.8 Singapore informed the meeting that the current FLAS had reaped benefit in terms of safety, capacity and efficiency. Although the Scenario 2 FLAS could increase human factor error due to the flight level allocated to the parallel routes, Singapore was open to either option.
3.9 Thailand, who had jointly proposed Scenario 1 FLAS with the Philippines at RVSM/TF/22, highlighted the transition problems in the Bangkok FIR, particularly on A1 and P901. Thailand supported Scenario 2.

3.10 Viet Nam noted the Scenario 2 FLAS would increase capacity and efficiency for flights operating on international routes in the Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh FIRs, and eliminate certain transition areas in the adjacent FIR. Viet Nam supported Scenario 2.

3.11 IATA was not requesting a change to the current FLAS, but would be willing to consider any FLAS which could be proven to provide equivalent level of safety, efficiency and regularity.

3.12 IFALPA did not see any problem in transition activities and supported the current FLAS.

3.13 IFATCA highlighted that all the surrounding areas had adopted the single alternate FLOS, and the flight level assignment should be reconsidered to cater for the traffic in/out of the areas. IFATCA supported Scenario 2.

3.14 The Philippines withdrew its support for proposed Scenario 1 that was developed jointly with Thailand at RVSM/TF/22. The Philippines expressed the desire to continue to operate with the current FLAS. Furthermore, the Philippines advised the meeting of its desire to adopt the single alternate FLOS without any modification in the Manila FIR. With the withdrawal of the support, it was felt that a consensus could not be reached to adopt the new FLAS proposed by the Philippines and Thailand at RVSM/TF/22. After deliberation on the current and proposed FLAS in terms of safety, capacity, regularity, transition workload, operations and harmonization, the meeting noted that the Philippines, despite undertaking an initiative to propose the changes in the FLAS during RVSM/TF/22, had disagreed with the adoption of proposed FLAS.

3.15 It was agreed that the endeavor to address the concerns expressed by several States should be continued. In this regard, with the completion of the one-year review for the WPAC/SCS airspace, SEACG/12 noted that the RVSM/TF was no longer involved with RVSM operations in this area, therefore, SEACG was required to continue to provide oversight of RVSM matters. SEACG/13 would be kept up to date on the RVSM issues. The meeting was of view that the new FLAS proposal could be raised at SEACG or, if necessary, at ATM/AIS/SAR Sub-group.

3.16 The meeting expressed appreciation to MAAR for the tireless work to conduct the safety assessment for the new FLAS in the SCS area. To facilitate MAAR in conducting the safety assessment on the proposed FLAS in the future, the meeting agreed that the States concerned should finalize and agree the details of the proposed FLAS before requesting MAAR to conduct the safety assessment.
3.17 Hong Kong, China suggested that a dedicated body be established under the auspices of ICAO to pursue measures/options to address concerns of several States in relation to the transition and capacity under the current FLAS arrangement in the SCS area. In light of the foregoing, the Secretariat advised that the States consult each other, and when the States concerned agree on a finalized FLAS, the meeting could be called.

**Agenda Item 4: Review of safety assessments by MAAR on proposed change(s) to existing FLOS**

4.1 MAAR provided the results of airspace safety assessment supporting the review of FLAS in the WPAC/SCS airspace. The meeting was advised that the safety assessment was conducted based on a one-month traffic sample data (TSD) collected in December 2005 and monthly LHD reports in 2005 - 2006 submitted by the concerning States in the WPAC/SCS region.

**WPAC/SCS States Concerning the FLAS Review**

4.2 Based on the FLAS review of the WPAC/SCS RVSM airspace, the concerning States and FIR were summarized below in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WPAC/SCS States</th>
<th>FIRs/AOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Sanya AOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Bali (as of 7 July 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ujung Pandang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Vientiane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kota Kinabalu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Manila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Hanoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ho Chi Minh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: States and FIRs under FLOS Review
Data Inquiry for the RVSM Airspace Safety Assessment

4.3 As APANPIRG has adopted December every year as the standard sample period for vertical and horizontal TSD collection, commencing from December 2005, December 2005 TSD of aircraft operating in the WPAC/SCS airspace was used to assess the safety of RVSM airspace under the different FLOS.

4.4 Appendix G to this Report provides the summary of monthly LHD reports received by MAAR since January 2005.

Summary of LHD Occurrences

4.5 MAAR provided the summary of the LHD occurrences associated with the RVSM implementation in WPAC/SCS airspace. The data gathered from the LHD reports are used to estimate risk from operational errors.

4.6 Figure 1 below summarizes the number of LHD occurrences and associated LHD duration (in minutes) by month in the WPAC/SCS RVSM airspace since January 2005.

![Figure 1: Summary of LHD Occurrences (by Month) in the WPAC/SCS RVSM Airspace](image)

4.7 Figure 2 summarizes the number of LHD occurrences and associated LHD duration (in minutes) by State in the WPAC/SCS RVSM airspace since January 2005.
**Summary of Received LHD Reports from States in SCS**

![Bar chart showing No. of Non-NIL LHD and Duration of LHD (Min) for different states.](chart.png)

**Figure 2: Summary of LHD Occurrences (by State) in the WPAC/SCS RVSM Airspace**

4.8 Table 2A below presents the summary of the total number of LHD occurrences by the cause of deviation, using the LHD letter-coding scheme in Table 2B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>No. of LHD Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>15 10 31 8 1 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>15 16 35 11 1 78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2A: Cause of LHD Occurrences in WPAC/SCS RVSM Airspace**
RVSM/TF/28
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Cause of Large Height Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Failure to climb/descend as cleared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Climb/descend without ATC Clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Entry into airspace at an incorrect flight level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Deviation due to turbulence or other weather related cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Deviation due to equipment failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Deviation due to collision avoidance system (TCAS) advisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Deviation due to contingency event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Aircraft not approved for operation in RVSM restricted airspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ATC system loop error; (e.g. pilot misunderstands clearance message or ATC issues incorrect clearance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Equipment control error encompassing incorrect operation of fully functional FMS or navigation system (e.g. by mistake the pilot incorrectly operates INS equipment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Incorrect transcription of ATC clearance or re-clearance into the FMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Wrong information faithfully transcribed into the FMS (e.g. flight plan followed rather than ATC clearance or original clearance followed instead of re-clearances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Error in ATC-unit-to ATC-unit transferred/transition message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Negative transfer received from transferring/transition ATC-unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2B: Codes Defining Causes of LHD Occurrences

4.9 In light of the above, the LHD occurrences in the WPAC/SCS RVSM airspace are summarized as follows:

a) Total of 78 LHD occurred in the WPAC/SCS RVSM airspace
b) Total LHD duration in 2005 was 73.9 minutes in 2005
c) 65 of 78 LHD occurrences (83%) are subject to Error in ATC-unit to ATC-unit transferred/transition message (Category M)

Analysis Scenarios

4.10 The meeting noted that MAAR had conducted the safety assessments for each scenario for the FLAS review in the WPAC/SCS RVSM airspace. To further assess the risk in greater details, MAAR had proposed the more descriptive scenario of FLAS to be analyzed, which had been reviewed at SCM RVSM FLOS.

Risk Assessment

4.11 MAAR provided the results of safety assessment for the WPAC/SCS RVSM airspace, considering three scenarios of flight level assignment. The meeting recognized that the internationally accepted collision risk methodology was applied in assessing the safety of implementing the RVSM in the WPAC/SCS airspace.

4.12 Table 3 below summarizes the results of the airspace safety oversight in terms of the technical, operational, and total risks for the RVSM implementation in the WPAC/SCS airspace.
Table 3: Risk Estimates for the RVSM Implementation in WPAC/SCS Airspace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Risk</th>
<th>Lower Bound Risk Estimation</th>
<th>TLS</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Scenario: Current FLOS (Modified Single Alternate FLOS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Risk</td>
<td>$3.48 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>Below Technical TLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Risk</td>
<td>$1.71 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Risk</td>
<td>$2.05 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>Below Overall TLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 1: Philippines and Thailand Proposals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Risk</td>
<td>$8.20 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>Below Technical TLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Risk</td>
<td>$4.21 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Risk</td>
<td>$5.03 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>Infringed Overall TLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 2: MAAR Proposals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Risk</td>
<td>$5.78 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>Below Technical TLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Risk</td>
<td>$3.38 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Risk</td>
<td>$3.95 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>Below Overall TLS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.13 Figures 3 and 4 present the trends of collision risk estimates for each month using the appropriate 12-month interval of LHD reports since January 2005.

Figure 3: Trends of Risk Estimates for Scenario 1 of FLOS in WPAC/SCS RVSM Airspace
4.14 The meeting noted that both technical and total risks for the Base Case and Scenario 2 estimated from the received TSD and LHD reports satisfied the TLS of no more than $2.5 \times 10^{-9}$ and $5.0 \times 10^{-9}$ fatal accidents per flight hour due to the loss of a correctly established vertical separation standard of 1,000 ft and to all causes, respectively.

4.15 IATA recalled that MAAR had provided RVSM/TF/22 with an update of LHD occurrences in the RVSM airspaces. It had been found that the LHD were more significant in the WPAC/SCS area. The most common contributing factor to the LHD in the Asia region, especially in the WPAC/SCS airspace, were the “Error in the ATC-unit to ATC-unit transferred/transition message (Category M)”, followed by the “Negative transfer received from the transitioning ATC-unit (Category N)”. RVSM/TF/22 also considered that the Categories M and N description should be amended to reflect that errors were attributed to the transition. In this regard, MAAR was requested to review the matter and to coordinate with the Pacific Aircraft Registry and Monitoring Organization (PARMO) and the Regional Airspace Safety Monitoring Advisory Group (RASMAG). RVSM/TF/22 requested MAAR to examine the LHDs in greater detail with a view to establishing the primary cause of the operational errors. IATA further noted that there were a large number of LHD in the Ujung Pandang FIR which had implemented the single alternate FLOS and these LHD should not be attributed to transition errors. IATA remarked that the LHD in the Hong Kong FIR and the Sanya AOR were also not caused by transition errors as there were no transitions effected in both areas.

**Agenda Item 5: Implementation Management Considerations**

5.1 As the meeting could not reach a consensus to implement the new FLAS, the implementation management was not considered. Consequently, two Working Papers and one Information Paper were not discussed.
Agenda Item 6: Any Other Business

Review of the 16th Meeting of the APANPIRG (APANPIRG/16)

6.1 APANPIRG/16 noted that five Task Force meetings, two special coordination meetings and one RVSM seminar had been held since the activities of the RVSM/TF were reported to APANPIRG/15 (August 2004, Bangkok). APANPIRG/16 also noted that RVSM/TF/22 reviewed the operation of RVSM in the airspace concerned and the effects of applying different FLOS requiring transition areas to be operated.

6.2 The Chairperson informed the meeting that the Task Force will be dissolved by the end of this year and commended the members of the Task Force for their extensive contribution and the outstanding achievements in the long and laborious road to the implementation of RVSM in both the Bay of Bengal and Beyond, and South China Sea areas.

Review of the 12th Meeting of the South-East Asia ATS Coordination Group (SEACG/12)

Review Current Operations across South-East Asia and Identify Problem Areas

6.3 The meeting noted that SEACG/12 (May 2005, Bangkok) was informed of the technical and operational risks assessed by APARMO for the 2002 implementation, i.e. the risk due to all causes being equal to 1.2 x 10^-9 fatal accidents per flight hour, which was well below the TLS of 5 x 10^-9 fatal accidents per flight hour. SEACG/12 was updated on the progress made by RVSM/TF to address the application of the different RVSM FLOS in the WPAC/SCS airspace. Recognizing the need to maintain safety, efficiency and regularity of operations in the WPAC/SCS airspace, RVSM/TF/22 developed a provisional revised plan for the assignment of RVSM levels and corresponding No-PDC procedures. RVSM/TF/22 agreed that key issues relating to the FLAS for the WPAC/SCS airspace would have to be addressed before any change could be made. Also, SEACG/12 was informed that MAAR would be required to undertake a safety assessment of the proposed FLOS for RVSM operations.

6.4 With the RVSM FLOS meeting which had been scheduled shortly before the Japan and the Republic of Korea implementation on 29 September 2005, Hong Kong, China considered that it would not be viable to complete all activities relating to the RVSM FLAS change. It was suggested that any change to the SCS FLAS should be delayed until after the 90-day review meeting of the Japan and the Republic of Korea RVSM implementation.

Review of the Fourth Meeting of the RASMAG (RASMAG/4)

Review the Airspace Safety Monitoring Arrangements in the Asia/Pacific Region and the Activities of Regional Safety Monitoring Agencies

6.5 The meeting noted that RASMAG/4 strongly endorsed the recommendation made to States by MAAR regarding the need to mitigate identified LHD occurrences of Category M, noting that APANPIRG/16 had established Conclusion 16/3 requiring the Regional Office to draw the attention of affected States to this situation and Conclusion 16/6 requiring that States that did not provide safety-related data in accordance with the requirements of regional safety monitoring agencies be included on the APANPIRG List of Deficiencies.
Tripartite RMA Meeting

6.6 The meeting was informed that the representatives from MAAR, Airservices Australia and PARMO met during RASMAG/4 in order to discharge the direction given in the Report of RASMAG/3 “for the three RMAs to meet with an aim to standardize their work methods” and to harmonize “different values being used in the [collision risk] modeling,” with special emphasis on RASMAG/3 “concerns regarding the way that TCAS reports were being included [in the risk assessment process].”

6.7 With regard to harmonizing the different values being used in the collision risk modeling, the meeting noted that the RMA representatives agreed that the value for the parameter should not be fixed for use everywhere within the region; rather the value appropriate to a particular safety assessment should reflect the range of aircraft types and speeds characteristic of the airspace under study.

6.8 The RMA representatives recalled a change, with effect from 24 November 2005, added the following paragraph to Annex 11 – Air Traffic Services:

3.3.4.1 For all airspace where a reduced vertical separation minimum of 300 m (1000 ft) is applied between FL 290 and FL 410 inclusive, a programme shall be instituted, on a regional basis, for monitoring the height-keeping performance of aircraft operating at these levels, in order to ensure that the implementation and continued application of this vertical separation minimum meets the safety objectives. The coverage of the height monitoring facilities provided under this programme shall be adequate to permit monitoring of the relevant aircraft types of all operators who operate in RVSM airspace.

Note. – The number of separate monitoring programmes should be restricted to the minimum necessary to effectively provide the required services for the region.

6.9 In light of the above, the RMA representatives had agreed that the new, regionally focused height-keeping performance monitoring requirements of Annex 11 required urgent attention, given their effective date of 24 November 2005.

Future RVSM/TF Meeting

6.10 The meeting tentatively agreed to the following schedule of the last meeting for the RVSM/TF:

RVSM/TF/29 (One year Review Japan/ROK) 14-16 Nov 2006 TBD

7. Closing of the Meeting

7.1 In closing the meeting, Mr. Kuah Kong Beng thanked all participants for their active participation and efforts.

----------------
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRUNEI DARUSSALAM</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td>Mr. James Shie</td>
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<td>Mr. Yue Poeng</td>
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<td>Ms. Huiling Hu</td>
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| HONG KONG, CHINA | Mr. Fan Wai Chuen Lucius  
Senior Safety and Quality Officer  
Civil Aviation Department  
4/F, Air Traffic Control Complex  
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Hong Kong International Airport  
Lantau, Hong Kong China | Tel: +852 2910 6448  
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| INDIA          | Mr. A.K. Dutta  
Deputy General Manager (ATM)  
Airports Authority of India, CHQ.  
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India | Tel: +91-11-2462 9015  
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E-mail: akdutta@aai.aero |
|                | Mr. Bijoy Cherian  
Asst. General Manager (ATM)  
Airports Authority of India, CHQ.  
Rajiv Gandhi Bhawan  
Safdarjung Airport  
New Delhi  
India | Tel: +91-11-2462 9015  
Fax: +91-11-2461 1078  
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAPAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mr. Natsuki Ibe | Chief, Operations Section  
ATC Division, JCAB  
Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport  
2-1-3, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo 100-8918  
Japan | Tel: +81-3-5253 8749  
Fax: +81-3-5253 1664  
E-mail: ibe-n2z7@mlit.go.jp |
| Mr. Takeshi Imoto | Manager, Operation and Procedures  
Naha Area Control Center, JCAB  
334 Kagamizu Naha-shi  
Okinawa 901-0142  
Japan | Tel: +81-98-858 7235  
Fax: +81-98-858 7419  
E-mail: imoto-t04os@nacc.mlit.go.jp |
| **LAO PDR** |                     |                 |
| Mr. Bountaeng Symoon | Chief of Vientiane Area Control Centre  
Lao Airports Authority  
Wattay International Airport  
P.O. Box 3175  
Vientiane  
Lao PDR | Tel: +856-21-512 006  
Fax: +856-21-512 216  
E-mail: bountaeng@yahoo.com |
| **MALAYSIA** |                     |                 |
| Mr. Tay Swee Boon | Deputy Director  
Air Traffic Control Centre  
Department of Civil Aviation  
Sultan Abdul Aziz Shah Airport  
47200 Subang  
Selangor Darul Ehsan  
Malaysia | Tel: +603-7847 3573  
Fax: +603-7847 3572  
E-mail: taysboon@gmail.com |
| Mdm. Wong Ing Ting | Deputy Director  
Department of Civil Aviation  
Kuching International Airport  
P.O. Box 1359  
93728 Kuching  
Sarawak  
Malaysia | Tel: +608-261 6532  
Fax: +608-245 4523  
E-mail: atcwbgg@tm.net.my |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/NAME</th>
<th>DESIGNATION/ADDRESS</th>
<th>CONTACT DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mr. Mohd Salihin Yahya | Assistant Director  
Air Traffic Service Division  
Department of Civil Aviation  
4th Floor, Podium Block B  
Lot 4G4 Precinct 4  
Federal Government Administrative Centre  
62570 Putrajaya  
Malaysia | Tel: +603-8871 4000  
Fax: +603-8871 4290  
E-mail: salihin@dca.gov.my |
| Mr. Soon Ping Vun | Centre Superintendent  
Kota Kinabalu Air Traffic Control Centre  
Department of Civil Aviation  
88618 Kota Kinabalu  
Sabah  
Malaysia | Tel: +608-8224 404  
Fax: +608-8219 170  
E-mail: - |
| MYANMAR          |                                                                                       |                               |
| Mr. Tike Aung    | ATC Officer, Grade I  
Department of Civil Aviation  
Yangon International Airport  
Yangon 11021  
Myanmar | Tel: +95-1-663 838  
Fax: +95-1-665 124  
E-mail: ats@dca.gov.mm |
| Ms. Ei Ei Kyaing | ATC Officer, Grade II  
Department of Civil Aviation  
Yangon International Airport  
Yangon 11021  
Myanmar | Tel: +95-1-663 838  
Fax: +95-1-665 124  
E-mail: ats@dca.gov.mm |
| NEPAL            |                                                                                       |                               |
| Mr. Mohan Adhikari | Chief, Civil Aviation Academy  
Sinamangal  
Kathmandu  
Nepal | Tel: +977-1-447 3171  
Fax +977-1-449 5068  
E-mail: amohan51@yahoo.com |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/NAME</th>
<th>DESIGNATION/ADDRESS</th>
<th>CONTACT DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHILIPPINES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mr. Enrico Herrera Salita | Assistant Chief ATC  
Manila Area Control Center  
Air Transportation Office  
MIA Rd, Pasay City  
Philippines 1300 | Tel: +632-879 9182, 851 0639  
Fax: +632-851 0639  
E-mail: ehsalita@yahoo.com |
| **SINGAPORE** | | |
| Mr. Kuah Kong Beng | Chief Air Traffic Control Officer  
Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore  
Singapore Changi Airport  
P.O. Box 1  
Singapore 918141 | Tel: +65-6541 2405  
Fax: +65-6545 6516  
E-mail: kuah_kong_beng@caas.gov.sg |
| Mr. Edmund Heng Cher Sian | Project Officer (Airspace)  
Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore  
Singapore Changi Airport  
P.O. Box 1  
Singapore 918141 | Tel: +65-6541 2457  
Fax: +65-6545 6516  
E-mail: Edmund_heng@caas.gov.sg |
| Mr. Tan Yean Guan | Project Officer (Airspace)  
Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore  
Singapore Changi Airport  
P.O. Box 1  
Singapore 918141 | Tel: +65-6541 2709  
Fax: +65-6545 6516  
E-mail: tan_yean_guan@caas.gov.sg |
| Mr. Loke Chee Yong | ATC Manager  
Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore  
Singapore Changi Airport  
P.O. Box 1  
Singapore 918141 | Tel: +65-6541 2457  
Fax: +65-6545 6516  
E-mail: loke_chee_yong@caas.gov.sg |
## List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/NAME</th>
<th>DESIGNATION/ADDRESS</th>
<th>CONTACT DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THAILAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mr. Thra Bundechanan | Flight Operations Inspector  
Flight Standards Bureau  
Department of Civil Aviation  
71 Soi Ngarmduplee, Rama IV Road  
Bangkok 10120, Thailand | Tel: +66-2-287 3547  
Fax: +66-2-286 2913  
E-mail: thra@rocketmail.com |
| F/O Nakorn Yoonpan | ATS Expert  
Airport Standards and Air Navigation Facilitating Division  
Department of Civil Aviation  
71 Soi Ngarmduplee, Rama IV Road  
Bangkok 10120, Thailand | Tel: +66-2-286 8159  
Fax: +66-2-286 8159  
E-mail: -         |
| Mr. Nopadol Sangngurn | Executive Expert  
Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd. (AEROTHAI)  
102 Ngarmduplee, Thungmahamek  
Sathorn, Bangkok 10120  
Thailand | Tel: +66-2-285 9054  
Fax: +66-2-285 9488  
E-mail: nopadol@aerothai.co.th |
| Mr. Tinnagorn Choowong | Air Traffic Control Manager  
Bangkok Area Control Centre  
Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd. (AEROTHAI)  
102 Ngamduplee, Thungmahamek  
Sathorn, Bangkok 10120  
Thailand        | Tel: +66-2-285 9975  
Mobile: +66-9-8166486  
Fax: +66-2-287 8560  
E-mail: tinnagorn.ch@aerothai.co.th |
| Mr. Winyou Sriwong | Air Traffic Control Manager  
Bangkok Area Control Centre  
Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd. (AEROTHAI)  
102 Ngamduplee, Thungmahamek  
Sathorn, Bangkok 10120  
Thailand | Tel: +66-2-285-9059  
Fax: +66-2-285-9406  
E-mail: winyou.sr@aerothai.co.th |
| Dr. Paisit Herabat | Executive Officer, Systems Engineering  
Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd. (AEROTHAI)  
102 Ngamduplee, Thungmahamek  
Sathorn, Bangkok 10120  
Thailand | Tel: +66-2-285 9191  
Fax: +66-2-285 9716  
E-mail: paisit@aerothai.co.th |
## List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/NAME</th>
<th>DESIGNATION/ADDRESS</th>
<th>CONTACT DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nuttakajorn Yanpirat</td>
<td>Senior Systems Engineer Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd. (AEROTHAI) 102 Ngamduplee Thungmahamek Bangkok 10120, Thailand</td>
<td>Tel: +66-2-287 8268 Fax: +66-2-285 9716 E-mail: <a href="mailto:nuttakajorn.ya@aerothai.co.th">nuttakajorn.ya@aerothai.co.th</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Saifon Obromsook</td>
<td>Senior Systems Engineer Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd. (AEROTHAI) 102 Ngamduplee Thungmahamek Bangkok 10120, Thailand</td>
<td>Tel: +66-2-287 8291 Fax: +66-2-285 9716 E-mail: <a href="mailto:saifon.ob@aerothai.co.th">saifon.ob@aerothai.co.th</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Chananya Pinkaewprasert</td>
<td>Senior Air Traffic Controller Bangkok Area Control Centre Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd. (AEROTHAI) 102 Ngamduplee Thungmahamek Bangkok 10120, Thailand</td>
<td>Tel: +66-2-285-9111 Fax: - E-mail: <a href="mailto:Chananya_pink@yahoo.com">Chananya_pink@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIET NAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nguyen The Hung</td>
<td>Manager, ATM-AIS Section Air Navigation Department Civil Aviation Administration of Vietnam Gialam Airport Hanoi 10000 The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam</td>
<td>Tel: +84-4-872 3600 Fax: +84-4-827 4194 E-mail: <a href="mailto:hungand@caa.gov.vn">hungand@caa.gov.vn</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nguyen Manh Quang</td>
<td>Deputy Director of ATS-AIS Division VATM/CAAV 119 Nguyen Son Street Long Bien District Hanoi The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam</td>
<td>Tel: +84-4-872 5272 Fax: +84-4-872 5281 E-mail: <a href="mailto:nguyennq2003@yahoo.co.uk">nguyennq2003@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/NAME</th>
<th>DESIGNATION/ADDRESS</th>
<th>CONTACT DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lam Phuc Anh Ha</td>
<td>Chief of Ha Noi ACC/Northern Region ATS&lt;br&gt;VATM/CAA&lt;br&gt;Hanoi&lt;br&gt;The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam</td>
<td>Tel: +84-4-886-5352&lt;br&gt;Fax: +84-4-886-6185&lt;br&gt;E-mail: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Phan Tat Thanh</td>
<td>Chief of Ho Chi Minh ACC/Southern Region ATS&lt;br&gt;VATM/CAA&lt;br&gt;Ho Chi Minh City&lt;br&gt;The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam</td>
<td>Tel: +84-8-845 7152&lt;br&gt;Fax: +84-8-844 3774&lt;br&gt;E-mail: <a href="mailto:phanthanhats@hcm.vm.vn">phanthanhats@hcm.vm.vn</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Soon Boon Hai</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Safety, Operations &amp; Infrastructure – Asia/Pacific&lt;br&gt;International Air Transport Association&lt;br&gt;77 Robinson Road&lt;br&gt;#05-00 SIA Building&lt;br&gt;Singapore 068896</td>
<td>Tel: +65-6239 7267&lt;br&gt;Fax: +65-6536 6267&lt;br&gt;E-mail: <a href="mailto:soonbh@iata.org">soonbh@iata.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Owen Dell</td>
<td>Manager, International Operations&lt;br&gt;Cathay Pacific Airways Limited&lt;br&gt;International Affairs Department&lt;br&gt;9/F Central Tower, Cathay Pacific City&lt;br&gt;8 Scenic Road&lt;br&gt;Hong Kong International Airport&lt;br&gt;Lantau, Hong Kong, China</td>
<td>Tel: +852-2747 8829&lt;br&gt;Fax: +852-2141 8829&lt;br&gt;E-mail: <a href="mailto:owen_dell@cathaypacific.com">owen_dell@cathaypacific.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Julian K. Y. Fung</td>
<td>Assistant Manager Route Development&lt;br&gt;Cathay Pacific Airways Limited&lt;br&gt;International Affairs Department&lt;br&gt;9/F Central Tower, Cathay Pacific City&lt;br&gt;8 Scenic Road&lt;br&gt;Hong Kong International Airport&lt;br&gt;Lantau, Hong Kong, China</td>
<td>Tel: +852-2747 3818&lt;br&gt;Fax: +852-2141 3818&lt;br&gt;E-mail: <a href="mailto:julian_fung@cathaypacific.com">julian_fung@cathaypacific.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STATE/NAME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/NAME</th>
<th>DESIGNATION/ADDRESS</th>
<th>CONTACT DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Capt. Aric Oh | Deputy Chief Pilot (Technical) Singapore Airlines Limited  
Flighy Operations Technical (SIN-STC 04-C)  
SIA Training Centre 04-C  
720 Upper Changi Road East  
Singapore 486852 | Tel: +65-6540 3694  
Fax: +65-6542 9564  
E-mail: aric_oh@singaporeair.com.sg |
| IFALPA     |                                                                                      |                                                                                  |
| Capt. Ng Kok Seong | ALPA Singapore  
IFALPA Representative  
47, Limau Grove  
Singapore 467841 | Tel: +65-6444 9425  
Fax: +65-6444 9425  
E-mail: kokseong@singnet.com.sg |
| IFATCA     |                                                                                      |                                                                                  |
| Mr. David Cheung | Executive Vice President, Asia/Pacific  
IFATCA  
FLAT C, 3/F, Tower 3, HillsBorough Court  
18 Old Peak Road, Mid Levels  
Hong Kong, China | Tel: +852-2910 6442  
Fax: +852-2910 0160  
E-mail: evpasp@ifatca.org |
| ICAO       |                                                                                      |                                                                                  |
| Mr. Kyotaro Harano | Regional Officer, ATM  
ICAO Asia and Pacific Office  
252/1 Vibhavadi Rangsit Road  
Ladyao, Chatuchak  
Bangkok 10900, Thailand | Tel: +66-2-537 8189 Ext. 159  
Fax: +66-2-537 8199  
E-mail: kharano@bangkok.icao.int  
ica_apac@bangkok.icao.int |
| Mr. Polawat Chootai | Regional Officer, ATM  
ICAO Asia and Pacific Office  
252/1 Vibhavadi Rangsit Road  
Ladyao, Chatuchak  
Bangkok 10900, Thailand | Tel: +66-2-537-8189 Ext. 151  
Fax: +66-2-537-8199  
E-mail: pchootai@bangkok.icao.int  
ica_apac@bangkopk.icao.int |
### WORKING PAPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>AGENDA</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PRESENTED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provisional Agenda</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review of RVSM/TF/22 Meeting and the Special Coordination Meeting to Finalize Arrangements for RVSM/TF Review of Western Pacific/South China Sea Flight Level Orientation Scheme (SCM RVSM FLOS)</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review of Action Plan</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Review of the 16th Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (APANPIRG/16)</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Switchover Date and Time and Procedures for the Change to RVSM Flight Level Assignment (FLAS)</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Flight Level Allocation Scheme (FLAS) in the Fukuoka FIR</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Review of the Twelfth Meeting of the South-East Asia ATS Coordination Group (SEACG/12)</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overview on the proposed change to the current SCS FLOS</td>
<td>IATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Study on current and proposed Flight Orientation Schemes (FLOS) in the Singapore FIR</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Revise Flight Level Allocation Base on Modified Single Alternate Flight Level Orientation Scheme (FLOS)</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Airspace Safety Assessment Supporting the Flight Level Orientation Scheme Review of the RVSM Implementation in Western Pacific/South China Sea</td>
<td>MAAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RVSM Implementation within Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh FIRs</td>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Revised Flight Level Allocation Based on Single Alternate Flight Level Orientation Scheme</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INFORMATION PAPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>AGENDA</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PRESENTED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>List of Working Papers (WPs) and Information Papers (IPs)</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Terms of Reference of RVSM/TF</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Terms of Reference of RVSM/TF Work Groups</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Review of the Fourth Meeting of the Regional Airspace Safety Monitoring Advisory Group (RASMAG/4)</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>AIP Amendment</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA

Agenda Item 1: Adoption of Agenda

Agenda Item 2: Operational Considerations
- Transition issues relating to the use of the modified single alternate FLOS and the single alternate FLOS
- Review of States studies of proposed change(s) to existing FLOS

Agenda Item 3: Review proposed change to level allocation developed by the RVSM/TF/22 meeting

Agenda Item 4: Review of safety assessments by MAAR on proposed change(s) to existing FLOS

Agenda Item 5: Implementation management considerations

Agenda Item 6: Any other business

-----------------------------
I. Parallel routes (Unidirectional)

II. Routes crossing Parallels (Bi-directional)

III. Routes crossing class II (Bi-directional)

IV. Other routes (Bi-directional)

IV, EB: Odd level
WB: Even level

II, EB 290, 330, 370, 410
WB 280, 300, 340, 380

III EB 310, 350, 390
WB 320, 360, 400
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>Usable FLOS/FLs</th>
<th>No-PDC FLs</th>
<th>No-PDC FLs for large-scale WX deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| L642, M771, N892, L625 (Class I) | Modified FLOS. All usable FLs | FL310, 320, 350, 360, 390, 400 | **EB**: FL310, 350, 390  
| | | | **WB**: FL320, 360, 400 |
| L628, G474/L628 (Class II) | Single FLOS. All usable FLs | **EB**: FL290, 330, 370  
| | | **WB**: FL280, 340, 380 |
| N500 (Class II) | Single FLOS. All usable FLs | **EB**: FL330  
| | | **WB**: FL300 |
| M765 (Class II) | Single FLOS. All usable FLs | **NEB**: FL290, 370  
| | | **SWB**: FL300, 380 |
| M768, R468-M768 (Class II) | Single FLOS. All usable FLs | **SEB**: FL330, 410  
| | | **NWB**: FL280, 340 |
| M753, M755 (Class III) | Single FLOS. All usable FLs | **SB**: FL310, 350  
| | | **NB**: FL280, 340 |
| L644 (Class II) | Single FLOS. All usable FLs | **SB**: FL330, 410 |
| N891 (Class III) | Single FLOS. All usable FLs | **SEB**: FL330, 390  
| | | **NWB**: FL320, 360 |
| A1/P901, A202 (Class IV) | Single FLOS. All usable FLs | **EB**: FL290, 330, 370, 390, 410  
| | | **WB**: FL280, 300, 340, 380, 400 |
| W1, W2 (Class IV) | Single FLOS. All usable FLs | **NB**: FL310, 350  
| | | **SB**: FL320, 360 |
| A206, R474, B465 (Class IV) | Single FLOS. All usable FLs | All usable FLs |
| Other domestic Routes | All usable FLs (In most cases, FLs are assigned below FL280) | | |

**Note:**
- **EB**: Eastbound  
- **SB**: Southbound  
- **SEB**: Southeastbound  
- **WB**: Westbound  
- **NB**: Northbound  
- **NWB**: Northwestbound
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### Summary of LHD Reports Received by MAAR since January 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Lao PDR</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIR</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Sanya</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>Ujung Pandang</td>
<td>Vientiane</td>
<td>Kota Kinabalu</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur</td>
<td>Manila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>