



*International Civil Aviation Organization*

**The Fifth Meeting of the Asia/Pacific ICAO Flight Plan and ATS Messages  
Implementation Task Force (FPL&AM/TF/5)**

Manila, Philippines, 8 - 9 November 2011

---

**Agenda Item 3: Review applicable documentation and guidance materials**

**‘W’ in Item 10a and ‘NONRVSM’ in Item 18**

(Presented by Australia)

**SUMMARY**

This paper is to discuss the issue of flight planning mutually exclusive RVSM entries and to highlight the possible need to software code management of contradictory entries.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Doc 4444 15th Edition, Appendix 2 currently states that a ‘W’ must be inserted in Item 10 “when prescribed by ATS”.
- 1.2 The Australian AIP Enroute section 39.2.5 currently states that “Approved operators must indicate RVSM approval by inserting ‘W’ in Item 10 (Equipment) of the ATS flight notification.”
- 1.3 Amendment 1 clarifies the meaning of the inclusion of ‘W’ in Item 10 to mean that the aircraft is RVSM approved and more specifically:
  - a. Relevant serviceable equipment is on board the aircraft, and
  - b. Equipment and capabilities are commensurate with flight crew qualifications, and
  - c. Authorisation has been obtained from the appropriate authority
- 1.4 Amendment 1 also standardises the way non-RVSM capability is filed by including it as a reason for special handling. That is, STS/NONRVSM: for a non-RVSM capable flight intending to operate in RVSM airspace.

**2. DISCUSSION**

- 2.1 Amendment 1 formalised the planning of the mutually exclusive entries ‘W’ (filed in Item 10a) and “NONRVSM” (filed in Item 18 STS/). Neither Amendment 1 nor the APAC Guidance Material (V3) suggest or mandate checking provisions to preclude the simultaneous filing of these entries.

- 2.2 In contrast, the APAC guidance material provides suggested software coding practice for consistency checking of related items in Item 10a and the Item 18 PBN indicator.
- 2.3 Paragraph 5.5 states, for example:
  - Consequently, a consistency check should be coded to evaluate NEW FPLs per the following guidelines:*
    - *If B1, B2, C1, C2, D1, D2, O1 or O2 are filed, then a “G” must be included in Field 10a;*
- 2.4 Australia has adopted these recommendations and added additional checks, for example; If Item 10a includes ‘R’ then Item 18 PBN/ must include at least one entry. If PBN/ contains one or more entries than Item 10a must include ‘R’.
- 2.5 Due to the ATS ability to apply reduced vertical separation standards between conflict pairs which flight plan RVSM capability (in designated airspace), it is critical that flight planning of this capability is correct.
- 2.6 Australia has seen instances where flight plans contain contrary RVSM indications.
- 2.7 Amendment 1 has now provided a standardised methodology to advise that an aircraft is non-RVSM.
- 2.8 It is possible to software code a simple check to ensure that the flight planning of RVSM capability is consistent within a flight plan. Australia has elected to provide this check in their 2012 flight plan specification and to reject flight plans to the queue for manual processing when ‘W’ and ‘NONRVSM’ are simultaneously filed.
- 2.9 Australia seeks to add the following paragraph to Section 5 Software Coding Considerations of the Asia/Pacific Guidance Material:

***Consistency between Item 10a and STS/ in Item 18***

*If W is filed in Item 10a then STS/NONRVSM must not exist in Item 18 and if STS/NONRVSM is filed in Item 18 then W must not exist in Item 10a.*

**3. ACTION BY THE MEETING**

- 3.1 The meeting is invited to
  - a) note the information provided, and
  - b) endorse or reject the proposal at 2.9.

.....