

**INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION
ASIA AND PACIFIC OFFICE**



**REPORT OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE ASIA/PACIFIC ICAO
FLIGHT PLAN & ATS MESSAGES IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE
AND SEMINAR (FPL&AM/TF/4 & SEMINAR)**

BANGKOK, THAILAND, 30 MAY – 03 JUNE 2011

The views expressed in this Report should be taken as those of the
Meeting and not the Organization

Approved by the Meeting
and published by the ICAO Asia and Pacific Office, Bangkok

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Table of Contents

	Page
History of the Meeting	
Introduction.....	i
Officers, Secretariat and Participants.....	i
Opening of the Meeting	i
Documentation and Working Language	i
 Report of the Meeting	
Agenda Item 1: Adoption of Agenda	1
Agenda Item 2: Seminar on Implementation of NEW ICAO Flight Plan.....	1
Agenda Item 3: Review outcomes of related meetings	3
Agenda Item 4: Review available documentation and guidance materials.....	6
Agenda Item 5: Aspects of implementation in Asia/Pacific region	7
Agenda Item 6: Regional strategies for implementation.....	19
Agenda Item 7: Review and update FPL&AM/TF Task List	21
Agenda Item 8: Any Other Business.....	21
Agenda Item 9: Date and Venue for the next FPL&AM/TF meeting.....	21
 Appendices	
Appendix A: List of Participants	A-1
Appendix B: List of Papers.....	B-1
Appendix C: Seminar Programme	C-1
Appendix D: Quarterly Questionnaire	D-1
Appendix E: FPL&AM/TF Task List.....	E-1

.....

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 The Fourth Meeting of the Asia/Pacific ICAO Flight Plan & ATS Messages Implementation Task Force and Seminar (FPL&AM/TF/4& Seminar) was held at the ICAO Asia and Pacific Regional Office, Bangkok, Thailand from 30 May to 03 June 2011.

1.2 Officers, Secretariat and Participants

1.2.1 Mr. Len Wicks, Regional Officer ATM (Air Traffic Management), acted as the Moderator of the Seminar and Secretary for the Task Force meeting. Mr. Stuart Douglas, Senior ATS Systems Specialist, Airways Corporation of New Zealand Ltd presided as the Chairman of the Task Force and assisted with the Seminar.

1.2.2 Eighty-four (84) participants from Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong China, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Thailand, United States, Viet Nam, IATA and IFATCA attended the meeting. A list of participants is in **Appendix A**.

1.3 Opening of the Meeting

1.3.1 Mr. Len Wicks, on behalf of Mr. Mokhtar A. Awan, Regional Director, ICAO Asia and Pacific Regional Office, opened the meeting and welcomed participants to Bangkok. Mr Wicks also welcomed the main Seminar presenter Mr. Tom Brady from ICAO HQ (Montreal) to Bangkok.

1.4 Documentation and Working Language

1.4.1 The meeting was conducted in English. All meeting documentation was in English.

1.4.2 18 working papers, 10 information papers and 1 flimsy were presented to the meeting. A list of the papers is at **Appendix B**.

.....

Agenda Item 1: Adoption of Agenda

1.1 The meeting adopted the following agenda:

- Agenda Item 1: Adoption of Agenda
- Agenda item 2: Seminar on Implementation of NEW ICAO Flight Plan
- Agenda item 3: Review outcomes of related meetings
- Agenda item 4: Review available documentation and guidance materials
 - o Amendment 1, 15th Edition PANS-ATM (Doc 4444)
 - o ICAO Guidance for Implementation of Flight Plan amendment
 - o Interim Strategy for the implementation of new ICAO flight plan and supporting ATS messages
- Agenda item 5: Aspects of implementation in Asia/Pacific region
- Agenda item 6: Regional strategies for implementation
- Agenda Item 7: Review and update FPL&ATM/TF Task List
- Agenda Item 8: Any other business
- Agenda Item 9: Date and venue for the next FPL&AM/TF meeting

Agenda Item 2: Seminar on Implementation of new ICAO Flight Plan

2.1 A copy of the seminar programme is attached as **Appendix C**.

2.2 The Seminar Presenter introduced the Seminar by emphasizing the critical nature of the FPL 2012 amendments, which had the potential to result in significant aviation disruption if the changes were not harmonized and completed by the applicability date. He further noted that this implementation could be compared to that of the Year 2000 (Y2K) changes.

2.3 It was noted that at 01 January 2011, States should already have completed the safety assessment and developed their system requirements in order to provide a detailed proposal for vendors, or to commence in-house software development. Moreover, he noted that those States that intended to use a vendor but had not yet signed a contract needed to do so urgently because the time to commence testing was not far away.

2.4 All seven ICAO Regions had agreed to transition in line with the timeline consistent with the APAC Regional Guidance Material. ICAO was asking for all Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) to be ready to accept the filing of both NEW and PRESENT plans by 01 July 2012. Seminar participants were advised noted that a transitional switchover to NEW format plans was preferable to a 'big bang'; thus many airlines and States were considering a change in the immediate days before 15 November 2012.

2.5 The need for ANSPs to work together was emphasized, to support States that were behind the implementation schedule, and to be in constant contact with the Regional Office.

2.6 States were reminded that they needed to assess the safety risks of the transition as part of their Safety Case under Annex 11, test the interfaces between transport media, and develop extensive implementation checklists, checks and transition processes. The military need to be involved in the transition planning as they often have defence systems that interface with the civil systems, ATFM (Air Traffic Flow Management) and third party systems, SAR (Search and Rescue) systems, noise management systems, and charging systems.

2.7 There was extensive discussion at the Seminar about manual flight data processing systems, which would need to be taken into account, especially in regard to training of staff. It was recognised that States will have to make smaller States within their FIR aware of the manual processes if they use such methods.

2.8 IATA presented its expectations for the implementation of the FPL 2012 change. Key issues – intended to harmonise regional requirements, as aircraft operations extend through multiple regions. There is also a huge reliance on digital messages. The major impact is not the flight plan format, but the ATS Messages. IATA would still like the FPL requirements to be a standard. The reason why this was not done was for flexibility in the first instance in terms of dealing with changing FPL requirements. In the future it may be a standard.

2.9 Australia noted that the use of a FPL 2012 converter required serious thought as there was a concern that such converters may affect downstream data being forwarded, and may not support the advanced features required by aircraft operations.

2.10 Two subjects from the Seminar were considered to warrant further discussion at the Task Force – the Last 72 hours strategy before 15 November 2012 (see Flimsy 1), and the need to have a EOBT (Estimated Off-Block Time) regional strategy.

2.11 Australia agreed to create a FPL 2012 Training Template, and NZ, USA, Japan and China would peer review this and augment as necessary. This was considered to be a valuable tool that could be ready for other APAC (Asia/Pacific) States or for HQ to use by the next Task Force meeting.

2.12 IFATCA noted that the FPL 2012 change should be as transparent to controllers as possible. Currently most ATC systems had a form of automation that recognised the capabilities of the aircraft as an add-on. The flight data personnel would be most affected by the change, especially for rejected flight plans, thus training aspects should concentrate on these personnel. There was a small education requirement for ATC about some of the new flight plan elements. For Flight Data personnel, education on the new abbreviations, set structure, and the concept of the transition was necessary.

2.13 There was extensive discussion on the financing of the FPL 2012 changes. IATA stated they did not support the concept that an extra charge should be imposed to cover the expense of implementation. They consider flight plan processing capabilities to be a core service and should therefore be included under the normal business of any unit. Any variation to the existing charges should only be made after due consultation with users. IATA stated they would be willing to support the development of any business case submissions made by ANSPs arranging funding for the FPL changes. Australia noted that there was no direct benefit to an ANSP from the FPL 2012 changes so it was difficult to make a business case to support the changes and thus some re-prioritisation of existing projects may occur. Cambodia stated that the changes would have safety and harmonisation benefits.

2.14 The following details the Seminar presentations:

- Session 1: Detailed Implementation Plans
- Session 2: Transition
- Session 3: Transport Media
- Session 4: Testing
- Session 5: Vendors and Stakeholders
- Session 6: Documentation
- Session 7: Safety Assurances
- Session 8: Training Templates
- Session 9: Spreading the Message
- Session 10: Finance
- Session 11: Strategic Support Teams

Agenda Item 3: Review outcomes of related meetings

Review Report of APANPIRG/21 (WP06)

3.1 The meeting reviewed material from the 21st Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (APANPIRG/21, 6-10 September 2010) report reviewed the outcomes of FPL&AM/TF/3 (23-24 August 2010, Bangkok).

Regional Supplementary Procedures (WP02)

3.2 Amendment 1 to PANS-ATM would introduce many changes that affect flight plan data such as navigation, performance and status designators. To avoid a conflict between PANS-ATM and the Regional Supplementary Procedures (SUPPS, Doc 7030), it was considered necessary to review the current regional material to ensure it aligned with the forthcoming Amendment 1.

3.3 The meeting discussed the current regional supplementary procedures in Doc 7030 which pertain to the MID/ASIA and PAC Regions, and proposed to amend certain passages that would not be consistent with Amendment 1. In addition, the meeting suggested that the differences between the MID/ASIA and PAC Regions regarding Mach number requirements should be made consistent between the Regions. The following proposed changes were identified so they could be formally coordinated and proposed by ICAO HQ as a global consequential amendment:

Doc 7030 Flight Planning – MID/ASIA**Chapter 2. FLIGHT PLANS****2.1 CONTENT – GENERAL**

(A2 – Chapter 3; P-ATM – Chapter 4 and Appendix 2)

2.1.1 Date of flight

Nil.

2.1.2 Area navigation (RNAV) specifications**2.1.2.1 State aircraft operating in the ICAO MID Region**

~~2.1.2.1.1 Operators of State aircraft not equipped with RNAV equipment meeting RNP 5 shall not insert the designator “S” or “R” in Item 10 of the flight plan.~~

~~2.1.2.1.2 Since such flights require special handling by air traffic control, “STS/NONRNAV” shall be inserted in Item 18 of the flight plan.~~

2.1.3 Required navigation performance (RNP) specifications

~~2.1.3.1 The letter R shall be inserted in Item 10 (Equipment) of the flight plan to indicate the aircraft meets the RNP type prescribed, has been appropriately approved and can comply with all conditions of that approval.~~

~~2.1.3.2 Operators of aircraft fitted with RNAV having a navigation accuracy meeting RNP 5 shall insert the designator “R” in Item 10 of the flight plan for operation in the ICAO MID Region, as specified in 4.1.1.5.3.~~

2.1.4 Minimum navigation performance specifications (MNPS)

Nil.

2.1.5 Reduced vertical separation minimum (RVSM) approved aircraft

~~2.1.5.1 The letter W shall be inserted in Item 10 (Equipment) of the flight plan if the aircraft and operator have received RVSM State approval, regardless of the requested flight level. The aircraft registration shall be inserted in Item 18 of the flight plan.~~

2.1.6 Non-RVSM-approved aircraft

Nil.

2.1.7 Non-RVSM-approved State aircraft

Nil.

2.1.8 Indication of 8.33 kHz channel spacing capability

Nil.

2.1.9 Route

Nil.

2.1.10 Estimated times

Nil.

2.1.11 Mach number

2.1.11.1 For turbo-jet aircraft intending to operate within airspace and on air routes to which longitudinal separation minima utilizing Mach number technique will be applied, the planned true Mach number shall be specified in Item 15 of the flight plan.

(No other changes in the MID/ASIA Section)

Doc 7030 Flight Planning – PAC

Chapter 2. FLIGHT PLANS

2.1 CONTENT – GENERAL

(A-2, Chapter 3; P-ATM – Chapter 4 and Appendix 2)

2.1.1 Date of flight

Nil.

2.1.2 Area navigation (RNAV) specifications

Nil.

2.1.3 Required navigation performance (RNP) specifications

~~2.1.3.1 The letter R shall be inserted in Item 10 (Equipment) of the flight plan to indicate the aircraft meets the RNP type prescribed, has been appropriately approved and can comply with all conditions of that approval for all operations in airspace or on ATS routes where an RNP type has been designated.~~

2.1.4 Minimum navigation performance specifications (MNPS)

Nil.

2.1.5 Reduced vertical separation minimum (RVSM)-approved aircraft

~~2.1.5.1 The letter W shall be inserted in Item 10 (Equipment) of the flight plan if the aircraft and operator have received RVSM State approval, regardless of the requested flight level. The aircraft registration shall be inserted in Item 18 of the flight plan.~~

2.1.6 Non-RVSM-approved aircraft

Nil.

2.1.7 Non-RVSM-approved State aircraft

Nil.

2.1.8 Indication of 8.33 kHz channel spacing capability

Nil.

2.1.9 Route

Nil.

2.1.10 Estimated times

Nil.

2.1.11 Mach number

~~2.1.11.1 For turbo-jet aircraft intending to operate within airspace and on air routes to which longitudinal separation minima utilizing Mach number technique will be applied within the Anchorage Oceanic and Oakland Oceanic FIRs, the planned true Mach number shall be specified in Item 15 of the flight plan.~~

(No other changes in the PAC Section)

Air Navigation Commission Review of Supplementary Requirements (IP05)

3.4 The Air Navigation Commission (ANC) had been requested by the European Air Navigation Planning Group (EANPG) to approve an amendment to EUR SUPPS to allow the use of supplementary designators in order to continue using the current EUROCONTROL system. Europe proposed to use at least one non-standard indicator, "EUR/. Previous discussion from the APAC FPL and AM TF/3 noted this would be at odds with the Asia/Pacific Guidance Material which stated "Systems should not accept indicators in Item 18 which are not defined in the PANS-ATM."

3.5 ICAO HQ advised that the ANC have rejected the EANPG request but it was noted that the existing RVR/ and RFP/ indicators would be retained in the European SUPPs.

Agenda Item 4: Review available documentation and guidance materialsAPAC Guidance Material Editorials and Suggested Amendments (WP/16)

4.1 The Asia/Pacific Guidance Material for the Implementation of Amendment 1 contained some errors and omissions. It was suggested that the material could be improved to reduce software coding, ambiguity and therefore cost of implementation.

4.2 Component STS/ (Status) contains extraneous information that significantly increases characters, without benefit to the APAC region. When variation is required it could be notified to affected adjacent States via individual agreements. The meeting discussed this and decided that the following should be retained as it was a valid requirement and current European practice.

STS/	STS/ copy over text o Except change "ATFMX" to "ATFMEXEMPTAPPROVED"
------	--

4.3 Component ORGN/ (Originator) contains an omission, so the meeting agreed that this needed an amendment as follows.

ORGN/	RMK/ORGN <text after ORGN/>
-------	-----------------------------

4.4 The conversion of DOF (Date of Flight) to PRESENT format introduced inconsistency if a NEW format flight plan was submitted more than 24 hours in advance. The meeting discussed the problem of airlines filing earlier than 24 hours ahead of flight. It was noted that the Regional Guidance Material for the transition already contained a recommended practice of not accepting plans earlier than 24 hours before flight.

4.5 Regarding the DOF practice after 15 November 2012, there was discussion whether there was a need for an amendment to Doc 7030, or whether this could simply be handled by State AIPs. Japan advised that they were still working on the problem and would advise their solution at a later date. The decision on how to manage this situation after the transition was deferred until there was sufficient information on whether this was a major problem. The reference for submission of flight plans is Annex 2, paragraph 3.3.1.

Agenda Item 5: Aspects of implementation in Asia/Pacific region

Observations of Amendment 1 and Flight Plan Format Analysis (WP04)

5.1 Hong Kong China noted that the system design of their Front End Processors (FEP) incorporated:

- i) interfacing and receiving all incoming ATS messages from the Automatic Message Switching System (AMSS);
- ii) converting messages from NEW format to PRESENT format; and
- iii) bypassing messages of PRESENT format to existing systems, i.e. AIDB and FDPS.

5.2 During the software design of the FEP, differences in the NEW and PRESENT formats were compared and analysed in detail to differentiate NEW format messages in order to perform subsequent format conversions. During this process, an inconsistency was identified in Appendix 3 description on Field 10 (b) under “Surveillance equipment and capabilities”.

5.3 In Appendix 2 of the Amendment, sub-paragraph 2.2, Field 10 (b), while “N – NIL” is deleted, a new paragraph is added: Insert ‘N’ if no surveillance equipment for the route to be flown is carried, or the equipment is unserviceable. In Appendix 3 of the Amendment, sub-paragraph 1.2 under Field 10 (b), unlike Appendix 2, while ‘N – Nil’ is crossed out, no new provision for the use of ‘N’ had been inserted. This implied ‘N’ cannot be used in this Field and operators would not be able to indicate that the equipment was not installed or unserviceable.

5.4 Hong Kong, China had determined that designator ‘N’ must be accepted for both PRESENT and NEW formats. The USA agreed with Hong Kong China that the ‘N’ should be in both Appendixes. ICAO HQ advised that they would take note of this, and if it was a typographical error, it would be fixed.

5.5 The algorithm in identifying flight plan formats for conversion or by-pass had been thoroughly analysed. In conclusion, it was considered that differentiation of these formats must be based on the data inserted in Flight Plan Items 10 and 18. In the message format analysis, it was considered that if unique data for both NEW and PRESENT were not found, then the FPL was in a ‘COMMON’ format that could be handled as either NEW or PRESENT.

5.6 For flights operating in the Hong Kong Flight Information Region (FIR), certain capabilities and equipment requirements indicated by the unique data for PRESENT format were not mandatory. These data may not be present in the majority of flight plans, thus may result in a large number of flight plans in a ‘COMMON’ format. In the software design, it was decided that flight plans in a ‘COMMON’ format would be processed as PRESENT before the NEW Flight Plan applicability date of 15 November 2012.

5.7 Australia noted that if they received a flight plan that has no indicators and could be either NEW or PRESENT format, then it would be considered to be NEW format.

Coordination for the Transition to the NEW Flight Plan Format (WP05)

5.8 APANPIRG/21 discussed Amendment 1 and agreed to Conclusion 21/13, which emphasised the need for urgent and appropriate coordination with neighbouring States and FIRs:

Conclusion 21/13 – Coordination for the Transition to the NEW Flight Plan Format among States

That, as the global and the regional harmonization is crucial in implementing the NEW flight plan format by 15 November 2012, States start close coordination soon with adjacent States/FIRs on transition about, but not limited to:

- i) difference of timing for transition between the States/FIRs;*
- ii) operations in the mixed environment of PRESENT and NEW;*
- iii) operational transition for AIDC; and*
- iv) procedures when ATS messages are not processed properly.*

5.9 A State Letter was issued in order to request information of this nature. In addition States were requested to provide information on the State's impact assessment of this change. Nine administrations responded to the survey, and those that responded indicated a high level of compliance with the Amendment 1 transition dates. Most respondents either indicated minimal transition impact (with the exception of the USA) or no information on this matter was submitted.

5.10 Australia stated that they had a period in their plan that allowed off-line testing with other ANSPs. No State present at the Task Force indicated that they had already commenced FPL 2012 coordination with other States. The meeting discussed the need to coordinate with airspace users. Information through AIC/AIP (Aeronautical Information Circular/Aeronautical Information Publication) was considered important to keep people informed. States were encouraged by IATA to test local carriers first and transition domestic operations early, if possible. ICAO HQ advised that FITS would be updated to allow extra information of this nature to be promulgated.

5.11 Australia suggested that a standard AIDC (ATS Inter-facility Data Communication) test programme that ANSPs could use would be beneficial. ICAO HQ noted the need for this from a global perspective, and the meeting agreed to develop this further through discussion between States.

Use of the New Reasons for Special Handling (WP09)

5.12 The United States noted that items under 'Reasons for Special Handling' (STS/) in the Amendment were described, but their intended use was not fully defined. There was a risk that States may interpret these differently, and provide inconsistent guidance to filers. In the worst case Air Traffic Control (ATC) personnel may make incorrect decisions based on the information filed.

5.13 Additionally, there was no clear definition of what a 'Reason for Special Handling' was. This was important in light of the ICAO's interpretation that all reasons for special handling not in STS/ must be in RMK/ (Remarks).

5.14 The following policy would be applied in the United States for special handling indicators.

- ATFMX (exempt from Air Traffic Flow Measures) - the problem is that for a flight through several FIRs, it was impossible to know which ATFM measures the flight is exempt from, so this indicator would not be used.
- FLTCK, HAZMAT (Flight Check flights and hazardous materials) - the new indicators do not allow for any additional information to be filed, so this may have to require the filing of redundant information in RMK/ in order to support all required filed information.
- MARSA (Military flights to Assume Responsibility for Separation) - the Amendment was ambiguous in that it could be interpreted as an intention to declare MARSA at some point in the flight, or it could be interpreted as meaning that MARSA had been declared, in which case only ATC should enter the information. The United States planned to interpret MARSA as an intention to declare MARSA at some point, but not an indication of the flight status.
- NONRVSM - the United States had procedures that allowed certain classes of non-RVSM aircraft to fly in RVSM (Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum) airspace and filing APVD NONRVSM indicated they were approved for Non-RVSM operations in RVSM airspace, whereas the STS/ item NONRVSM was interpreted as meaning that a non-RVSM flight intended to operate in RVSM airspace but it did not confirm approval.

5.15 The United States noted that many items in the flight plan Field 10 equipment and capability (such as lack of a transponder) influenced how a flight was handled by ATC. These differences did not constitute 'special handling', which would therefore appear to reflect:

- a) procedures that apply to only a special class of flights; and
- b) the need for some type of operational priority by those flights.

5.16 The meeting discussed the fact that if a 'W' was not filed, then it was axiomatic that the flight was non-RVSM and thus the reasons for the NONRVSM indicator were unclear. It was evident that a Circular explaining the background, reasons and interpretation for elements of FPL 2012 would have been useful to States trying to implement Amendment 1.

Equipment, Capability and Standards (WP10)

5.17 In order to file for specific capability in a flight plan, certification to a standard was often required but this had not been addressed in Document 4444. There was a risk that an airspace user could file a capability based on the required standard in one country that was different from the standard required in another country.

5.18 This problem existed in the near-term for ADS-B, and in the future may be an issue for GNSS and PBN capabilities. There are various sets of standards for ADS-B equipment including RTCA DO 260-A/DO 282-A and RTCA DO 260B/DO-282B.

5.19 GNSS Augmentation was described in ICAO Document 9849 and in Annex 10, Volume 1. There were no firm instructions regarding exactly what capability to file, or what standards the capability should meet. It was also not clear which ANSPs will require this information, and for what purpose. A consensus should be reached regarding acceptable content to reflect GNSS Augmentation.

5.20 In the future, it was not hard to imagine the prospect of G (for GNSS, Global Navigation Satellite System) being inadequate if not all GNSS systems meet the same standards. Similarly, Performance Based Navigation (PBN) standards were complex. Therefore, care should be taken to ensure that filed PBN capabilities did not become ambiguous.

5.21 IATA suggested that there should be some form of review to consider further improvements to the flight plan format in order to deal with advances in aviation such as augmentation.

5.22 The interpretation of which standard would apply to equipment such as ADS-B (Automatic Dependent Surveillance – Broadcast) was a regulatory matter for the State of Registry and the meeting considered that this was not a matter for the Task Force itself. Australia did not discriminate between the three standards, and this was consistent with the recommendation of the APAC ADS-B TF.

Interpretation of Certain Field 10b Capabilities (WP11)

5.23 There was ambiguity regarding the expected practices for filing transponder and ADS-B capability. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and EUROCONTROL had interpreted these capabilities differently in terms of coding, but had agreed on instructions to users.

5.24 Prior to Amendment 1, the instruction for Field 10b stated that one letter should be included to define the transponder capability, optionally followed by a second letter for Automatic Dependent Surveillance capability. In Amendment 1 the wording was changed to a generic ‘one or more of the following descriptors’. As worded, it was technically legal to include more than one letter for the transponder, but it appears there was no intention to allow or require multiple transponder letters.

5.25 The FAA’s automation systems would have trouble correctly interpreting multiple letters (e.g. if both ‘A’ and ‘C’ were filed). Today the A is interpreted as meaning Mode A but no Mode C (even though the wording simply says Mode A). Therefore, the FAA was instructing users to file only one letter for transponder, as was done today. EUROCONTROL automation would permit more than one transponder letter as long as they didn’t conflict.

5.26 Each of the three ADS-B link types—UAT, 1090-ES, and VDL—could be filed as ‘out’ or ‘out’ and ‘in’. Based on the definition, the United States believed only one designator per link type should be filed (e.g. B1 or B2 but not B1B2). Including both is redundant. Therefore, the United States is instructing filers to include only one designator per link type.

5.27 EUROCONTROL automation would accept both indicators for a link type, since they are not inconsistent (e.g. B1B2). If one letter for transponder was filed, and only one designator for each link type, the maximum possible size for Field 10b becomes 11 characters (one character transponder; six characters ADS-B; 4 characters ADS-C (Contract)). New Zealand confirmed that this was consistent with their interpretation. Australia would allow up to 20 characters in 10b. It appeared to the meeting that the European interpretation was different to the USA and APAC States, and was raised as a concern, which would need to be monitored by States. IATA believed there was no need to indicate multiple ‘lesser’ capabilities, as this was redundant.

Handling of Non-Standard Field 18 Information (WP12)

5.28 The United States submitted that several Field 18 instructions suggest a practice but did not seem to absolutely require it.

1.1.1 *“Note.— Use of indicators not included under this item may result in data being rejected, processed incorrectly or lost.”*

1.1.2 *“Hyphens or oblique strokes should only be used as prescribed below.”*

5.29 The first note was unclear as to what might happen if a non-standard indicator was encountered. Also, in light of recent discussions regarding existing non-standard indicators such as RVR/ (Runway Visual Range) and RFP/ (Replacement Flight Plan), a distinction may have to be made between non-standard indicators published in an AIP or a Regional Supplemental Procedure and unrecognised indicators.

5.30 It appeared that the use of existing non-standard indicators defined in AIPs or SUPPs would continue. This meant that the approach outlined in Section 5.6 (copied below) of the APAC guidance may need to be reconsidered. This was considered possible after a review by ICAO HQ of several inconsistencies:

Systems should not accept indicators in Item 18 which are not defined in the PANS-ATM. If internal requirements create the need to use a ‘local’ nonstandard indicator, measures must be taken to ensure that airspace users filing with multiple FIRs are not impacted.

5.31 The United States commented that the existing guidance in Section 5.6 of the Guidance Material remained satisfactory. The meeting noted that some FAA systems would initially accept a flight plan with an unknown indicator, remove the oblique stroke, and add the information to RMK/. The FAA planned to evolve to eventually reject a flight plan with an unknown indicator.

5.32 Regarding the use of the oblique stroke in Field 18, this should be only be used in Field 18 as part of the indicator. However it was not clear what should be done if when it is not used that way. If the oblique stroke was preceded by one to four letters, the FAA assumed that it was intended as part of an indicator, and was handled as described in the above discussions. If the oblique stroke was not part of an indicator, it was probably punctuation in free text. Examples include:

10/09/2010 (date)

ETOPS 120MI NS/O850NM RULE (punctuation)

. . 3724/O7731 . . (latitude/longitude)

5.33 The APAC Guidance Material does not directly address this case. Alternatives could include rejection of the flight plan, removal of the oblique stroke, or replacement of the oblique stroke with another character.

5.34 New Zealand stated that their domestic ATM system would reject unknown indicators, while the oceanic system would strip the oblique and place the text in the RMK. Australia rejected all non Doc 4444 indicators.

5.35 The meeting agreed that operators filing incorrect flight plan information needed to be followed up by actions that included State regulatory intervention if necessary. Australia noted that some airlines file plans via a third party provider, so this meant that the airlines had to be pressured to ensure the third party followed the correct format. IATA reminded the meeting that both civil and military airspace users needed to be kept informed and educated as to the need to comply with the standards. The Philippines asked if IATA was dealing with the third party providers. IATA was not, and expected the airlines to deal with this aspect as contracted.

5.36 The meeting discussed the need for guidance to users as to why some plans were rejected. The FAA offered a link on their web site which provided examples:

General guidance: <http://www.faa.gov/ato?k=fpl>

Guidance on the Amendment 1 implementation:
<http://www.faa.gov/go/fpl2012>

5.37 It was clear from the papers submitted by the United States that there were some clarifications required to ensure a consistent interpretation. ICAO HQ would initiate an inter-regional discussion in order to deal with these issues. The HQ representative took an action from the meeting to put together a forum to progress this from an inter-regional and global perspective. This was consistent with the submission by the United States in IP09.

Field 18 – RMK (WP15)

5.38 The development of the new ICAO FPL and ATM Messaging format provided a much needed update recognising technological advances that have occurred. It was also an opportunity to ensure FPL systems accommodate the needs of all Users (both ANSPs and operators).

5.39 Prior to the amendment, RMK in field 18 had been used as a ‘catch all’ accommodating both ATC and State requirements. Following implementation of the new format, new codes for ADS-B and TALT (Takeoff Alternate) will cater for these aspects but the others will still need to be denoted.

5.40 With the long-haul nature of many operations with multiple State requirements to be met, there would be an on-going requirement to annotate multiple items under RMK even after the new format becomes effective. ICAO guidance (both current and the amendment) provides no detail as to how this situation should be accommodated. There was no prescribed limit to either field length for field 18 or restriction on the use of multiple RMK.

5.41 Some States however have already prescribed their own requirements and did not accept multiple RMK items, while other States allowed the use of multiple items under a single RMK (e.g. RMK/IFPS REROUTE ACCEPTED/TURKEY XXXXX/TCAS EQUIPPED ACARS EQUIPPED). This remedy could make it difficult to distinguish between a separator and part of a single message. Under some State/Regional requirements, certain characters were specifically precluded (e.g. CFMU handbook stipulates that “ () ^ % \$ # / - were not allowed to be used in the sub-field). Obviously while these variations may be acceptable to some ATC systems, it may cause messages to be rejected by others.

5.42 With the reliance on automated systems today, it was important that some degree of commonality be established. The ICAO guidance already reflected the importance of this in that the sequence of data fields under field 18 was prescribed under the new format.

5.43 With system design and implementation currently underway, it was important that this matter be considered in the immediate term, while potential remains for changes or accommodations to be made in the design. IATA stated that some ICAO guidance as to how States should resolve this would be welcome in the interests of global harmonisation and standardisation. This would be part of the inter-Regional forum discussions.

5.44 Australia stressed that States needed to determine what capacity constraints were necessary or in place for various FPL fields, particularly Field 18. The United States had researched the field lengths and this information would be made available in the future. The meeting noted that in the future, increasingly automated FDPS may not recognise characters in Field 18.

Australian Flight Plan Processing Assumptions for 2012 Transition (IP04)

5.45 Although the Asia/Pacific Guidance Material was comprehensive in detailing various software coding considerations and conversion, there areas of ambiguity remained until actual planning and configuration changes were made that highlight gaps in knowledge of how messages and flight plans would be received. The transition assumptions made by Australia are listed below.

General

- a) Australia will accept NEW format flight plans from 26th July 2012.
- b) Where a received flight plan satisfies both NEW and PRESENT formats, it will be processed as NEW.
- c) Any messages sent from Australia will be sent in the format received by the filer except when the immediately adjacent FIR is not NEW capable. Messages will be converted to PRESENT in this case.
- d) If a NEW format message is received when only a PRESENT flight plan is held, information will be extracted and converted to update the PRESENT flight plan.
- e) Australia intends to discontinue support for PRESENT format after 15 November 2012.

DOF

- a) Date of Flight, as a single element from Field 18, will be sent when filed in NEW format and contained in the original notification for DEP, DLA, CHG, RQP, RQS and CNL.
- b) If Date of Flight is not filed for NEW format then “-0” will be sent for the above message types.

AIDC

- a) Australia will be including DOF, when the flight plan is filed in NEW format, in any Field 18 amendment (Field 22) for;
 - i. PAC
 - ii. ABI
 - iii. CDN
 - iv. MAC
- b) Where an adjacent ANSP is not NEW capable Field 10 and Field 18 will be converted to PRESENT format.
- c) Existing Letters of Agreement with neighbouring ANSPs may be utilised for special procedures where necessary.

5.46 These assumptions and previously mentioned interpretations were expected to be discussed by a contact group that could communicate via email or if necessary, teleconference. Eventually, material that was agreed by this contact group could be presented to a future Task Force.

5.47 The meeting discussed how EOBT would change the dynamics of flight plan operation as the current system used ETD (Estimated Time of Departure). IATA would check the possible effects of the different interpretations and possible effects on ATFM.

5.48 Japan asked about the use of DOF in the AIDC message, which according to the APAC Guidance Material was a matter for bilateral agreement. Australia confirmed that the use of DOF in AIDC messages was subject to further internal discussion and bilateral agreements.

Airline Readiness (WP17)

5.49 IATA had recently undertaken another survey of airlines operating within the Asia/Pacific Regions to confirm the status of preparations of airline operators. The survey was conducted in April - May 2011 and focused all major airlines operating across international borders (including non-members).

5.50 Of the Asia/Pacific-based airlines, there were 38 respondents, 36 confirmed readiness with two unsure (awaiting vendor solution). The operational readiness date varied from September 2011 until the third quarter of 2012. 15 airlines were yet to finalise target dates, but expected to be ready in the first half of 2012. All confirmed their readiness to support some testing.

5.51 The survey also queried airline members from outside the Asia Pacific region who operated significantly within this region. All confirmed their readiness and support for State testing.

5.52 States need a communications implementation plan to ensure that information could be delivered to other States and to support the Regional Office questionnaire. The HQ representative confirmed that the FITS would be upgraded to allow this information from the questionnaire to be displayed in an appropriate manner.

State Implementation Progress

Australia

5.53 Australia had been developing technologies such as ATS surveillance that had taken priority up until now, but FPL 2012 had the necessary priority at this time. AirServices Australia was working with the Australian Defence Force and the regulator (CASA). Australia had not yet signed a contract with a software vendor, and had noted that vendors had different interpretations of Amendment 1. The date for transition to external testing was different from the Regional Guidance Material phases because it lined up with the AIRAC date (26 July). Australia was developing a Safety Case, and assisting Nauru, Indonesia and the Solomon Islands.

Bangladesh (IP10)

5.54 Bangladesh's existing AFTN (AMSS) system affecting flight plan processing was expected to be replaced within one year and an international tender had attracted interest from several vendors. If Bangladesh failed to procure the ATN system within a year, a converter for onward transmission/acceptance of the NEW FPL would be necessary.

Cambodia

5.55 Cambodia was aware of the FPL transition plan, and had signed a contract with a vendor (Thales).

China

5.56 China had a detailed plan to implement FPL 2012. Software was expected to be ready by September 2011, which was being developed in-house. At a sidebar meeting during the Seminar, China briefed the Secretariat on their implementation plans. China advised that they had top-level support and the necessary resources to complete the task, which was acknowledged to be a difficult one with nine separate FIRs and different ATM systems. China advised that they would amend their expected start of external testing as early as possible, based on the progress of their internal software testing from early 2012.

Hong Kong China

5.57 Hong Kong China had completed the procurement and the design of the front end processor in house. Coordination was on-going with local airlines at regular meetings.

Fiji

5.58 A gap analysis has been conducted, and there were two proposals from vendors. The ANSP was coordinating with ANSPs in adjacent FIRs.

India (IP08)

5.59 India had commenced preparations to implement Amendment 1 to the 15th Edition of PANS-ATM Doc4444 by initiating software changes in-house. Based on Regional Guidance Material, India had started the task of incorporating software changes in the AFTN Message Switch facilities; namely, the Automatic Message Switching System (AMSS) which handled FPL and associated ATS messages.

5.60 After completing the internal testing of AMSS system with software for the NEW FPL and ATS messages, intra-system testing had been successfully carried out between Delhi and Varanasi in the second week of May 2011.

5.61 Regarding ATM automation systems and newly installed AMHS systems, negotiations with vendors had been completed and an order was expected to be placed shortly to affect the capability of handling the NEW Flight Plan and associated ATS Messages. From 15 November 2012 only NEW format was expected to be used, except when an adjacent FIR could only accept PRESENT, then data would have to be transmitted in this form.

5.62 India was concerned that flight plans and associated messages that were commonly relayed to ATC facilities by the AFTN network may be affected. Australia clarified that the ATS messages should not be affected through the AFTN network as it was just a transport medium responsible for forwarding these messages.

5.63 India suggested that the FPL & AM Task Force may like to conduct a survey through a questionnaire distributed to all the states to ascertain their preparedness to accept and process the NEW FPL and ATS messages. Such a survey was considered useful in helping to identify the issues involved and to develop further strategies to tackle these.

Indonesia (IP06)

5.64 Indonesia advised that the ICAO New Flight Plan Format and ATS Messages would affect ATC Operations in the Jakarta FIR and Ujung Pandang FIR. Both ATM Systems were not able to handle and process NEW format Flight Plans and could not store the data five days before EOBT. The MATSC (Makassar ATS Centre) would be upgraded to have capabilities to process New Flight Plan Format and ATS Messages in 2011/12. However JAATS (Jakarta ATS Centre) would wait for total replacement of the ATM system. The replacement schedule was expected to be started in 2013 and the backup system (Eurocat C) would be upgraded in 2012.

5.65 ATM Systems in JAATS, Bali, Surabaya, and Balikpapan would use Flight Plan converter software to translate between NEW and PRESENT format to be used for ATC Operation purposes, which would be developed in-house and with local vendors.

5.66 Indonesia had established a National Task Force to implement FPL 2012 in order to review related documents and procedures, publish the AIC, conduct workshops and training for those who are related to Flight Planning process, and oversee software testing and monitoring.

Japan

5.67 Japan would upgrade their ATM system to be FPL 2012 compliant in 2012, which was part of a total change plan by 2015. Japan had been discussing the specification with the vendor NEC, and was expecting to start Phase 2 in April after delivery of software. Japan would start internal testing on 1 April and external testing on 1 July. This testing will be conducted using their testing facilities. Japan would start accepting NEW on 18 October in accordance with agreements with adjacent States and wanted to avoid changes during the high traffic (Summer) season.

Lao People's Democratic Republic

5.68 Lao PDR had finished a master plan and was convening a workshop in the next two weeks. The vendor for Lao PDR was Thales.

Malaysia (IP07)

5.69 Malaysia had identified their system requirements, and vendors had submitted proposals. The Malaysia Automated Aeronautical Information System (MAAIS) was an Automatic Flight Plan and ATS Messages system that supported NOTAM management. It had been identified that the FPL and ATS messages mask needed to be upgraded in order to support the new ICAO FPL format and DOF fields.

5.70 The Aeronautical Information Terminal (AIT) was a graphical user interface for the AFTN system. The Flight Plan and ATS messages mask had also been identified for upgrade to support the new ICAO FPL format. The AFTN Server and Agent would be replaced by an AFTN/AMHS by the end of 2011. The AIT FPL and ATS messages mask capable of handling the NEW format will be operational by the end of 2011. The FPL and ATS associated masks in the Flight Data Processor Server (FDP) will be upgraded to support the new identifiers.

5.71 The three FDPs (Kuala Lumpur Air Traffic Control Centre, Kota Kinabalu Air Traffic Control Centre and Kuching Air Traffic Control Sub-Centre) were in the process of being upgraded to the new ICAO FPL requirements to be ready by December 2011.

5.72 DOF was recommended to be included in all FPL and associated messages submitted for transmission for easy data association and future plans for flight plan storage and updating.

5.73 On the proposal of inserting '0' for current day, Malaysia believed some software changes would be necessary, and this may create errors, especially for those ANSP systems that were not compliant yet with the DOF handling during the Transition Stage.

5.74 To effectively manage FPLs filed in advance by up to 5 days or 120 hours, Malaysia believed an Integrated Initial Flight Plan System (IFPS) was required and suggested that EUROCONTROL's IFPS/Regional Documents be used as guideline. Malaysia was expecting to hold flight plans that had been submitted locally more than 24 hours ETD until the plan was within 24 hours. Australia noted that the APAC region was not following IFPS guidance but ICAO APAC Regional Guidance material.

Mongolia

5.75 The CAA had approved the transition plan. The vendor implementing 2012 Flight Plan processing was Avitech and this was planned to be completed by October 2011. Negotiation with Indra for a new ATM system, including SSR was underway. Transition to NEW format was expected by September 2012.

Myanmar

5.76 Like Lao PDR, Myanmar were using Thales and discussing an upgrade. Myanmar had not received a final proposal.

New Zealand (IP03)

5.77 New Zealand advised that an Aeronautical Information Circular (AIC 5/11) had been published as well as educational material in magazines to:

- announce the changes to the ICAO Flight Plan;
- define NEW/PRESENT;
- outline the implementation strategy; and
- advise a guide to the changes was available on the CAA website including:
 - a summary of the changes;
 - the text of the draft amendment to NZ AIP ENR 1.10;
 - examples of NEW ATS messages;
 - the ICAO Asia/Pacific Regional Guidance Material; and
 - provides a link to the ICAO FITS website

5.78 Change Specifications had been written for the New Zealand ATM systems and software changes had been scoped. Design work had commenced, and internal testing was expected to commence early in 2012. New Zealand noted that there had been some management competition for software resource.

Philippines

5.79 The Eurocat system was expected to be decommissioned once the new Czech system becomes fully operational. New requirements for FPL 2012 are due to be included for the upgrade of this new Czech system. There was no exact timetable for this development. Internal testing of existing Comsoft/AFTN equipment had been undertaken and was successful with some procedural modifications in the handling of FPL and ATS messages.

Republic of Korea

5.80 The task force had decided to use a convertor from a local company. One of the ATM systems (Incheon) was being provided by Thales and discussions for an upgrade were in progress. Korea expected that they would be able to accept the NEW FPL by October 2012.

Singapore (IP02)

5.81 The NEW ICAO Flight Plan and associated ATS Update Messages was expected to have considerable impact on the Singapore ATC operations, as existing ATC systems did not support the NEW Flight Plan format. Certain Singapore ATC operations require manual processing of flight plan information after the flight plans were converted from NEW to PRESENT format. Singapore expected an increase in workload brought about by the need to read and process more information in the flight plans.

5.82 It was also recognized that PRESENT format flight plans may still be filed after the cutover date. As such, Singapore plans to support the receiving and sending of flight plans in both PRESENT and NEW formats for a short period of time after the cutover date. With such a need in mind, Singapore expected to incur extra costs for installation and maintenance of additional equipment such as the Flight Plan convertor to support both PRESENT and NEW flight plan formats at the same time.

5.83 Singapore was committed to support the NEW ICAO Flight Plan and associated ATS Update Messages. However, Singapore's ability to accept flight plans in the NEW format by 15 November 2012 would be contingent on the availability of the Flight Plan convertor in the market and the success in integrating the convertor with existing ATC systems. The fallback plan if there was a problem with the converter was to use manual processing in the interim period. Singapore expected to be able to convert to NEW format before 15 November 2012.

5.84 Singapore was looking for a feature that stored any plan that was submitted earlier than 24 hours before flight. Australia noted that the stored plan system would need to be able to manage any changes that occurred from the submission time until the time of change, and would therefore require considerable complexity capability in the convertor system.

Thailand

5.85 Thailand was implementing a new Flight Data Management System to accommodate FPL 2012 in line with APAC Guidelines, internally developed.

United States

5.86 The United States had a large number of impacted systems. The domestic operation was transiting to new system. The USA was implementing FPL 2012 in legacy and new systems, using in-house software. Honolulu and Anchorage were two systems with unique characteristics that had to be updated.

Viet Nam

5.87 A FPL 2012 Study Group of Viet Nam Air Traffic Management had been established. Coordination between airspace users and ANSP was underway.

Quarterly Questionnaire (WP18)

5.88 During the Asia/Pacific ICAO Flight Plan and ATS Messages Implementation Task Force Seminar it had become apparent that there was a need to supplement the information available on the FITS and also provide support to enhanced FITS functionality through regular, updated information.

5.89 It is therefore recommended that a questionnaire is completed by the FPL 2012 Points of Contact every quarter, by:

- 1 July 2011;
- 1 October 2011;
- 1 January 2012;
- 1 April 2012; and if required,
- 1 July 2012.

5.90 The meeting discussed and amended the Questionnaire, and agreed to the recommended timeline. The questionnaire is attached as **Appendix D**.

Agenda Item 6: Regional strategies for implementation

Example Aeronautical Information Circular for 2012 ICAO FPL (WP07)

6.1 Australia had published an AIC detailing transition arrangements and implementation details for the 2012 ICAO Flight Plan. This was considered to be a useful as a guide for the APAC Regions. It was noted that paragraph 5.2 may need a caveat if used by other States. IATA supported this initiative and agreed that the various links within the AIC were important.

Flight Plan Implementation Tracking System Update (WP08)

6.2 The APAC Regional Office had issued a series of State letters in the last 18 months to highlight the need to raise awareness in the Asia/Pacific Regions, and to urge the facilitation of information indicating the preparedness of APC administrations to the Regional Office in order to support FITS. The meeting discussed the need to support States that may be falling behind, in the form of support from International Organizations, and experts from 'Champion States'.

Flight Identification and Designators (WP13)

6.3 With every ICAO region having now established a Task force (or similar) to prepare for the changes, IATA considered it was opportune to review some of the content of the Flight plan and note some potential impacts.

6.4 When a flight experiences a significant delay (such as into the next day), there was potential for two FPLs to exist with the same callsign. To alleviate this, airlines might append the suffix "D" in Item 7 of the FPL after the flight identification. This was common practice among many operators in order to:

- distinguish from the same call sign flight operating the next day;
- retain overflight permissions associated with aircraft designators; and
- maintain commonality with passenger notification systems.

6.5 This practice however is not 'standardised' and may lead to confusion between both operators and ANSPs where flights may need to 'change callsigns' as they progress in their flight. In other regions, States may require other indicators. For example, the suffix 'X' when delayed by 24 hours and 'Y' when delayed by 48 hours.

6.6 For States where specific over flight approval is required, the use of an appropriate designator is extremely important as a change in Flight Identification can mean over flight approval is denied.

6.7 With the transition currently underway, it is an opportune time to consider the implication of these events and potentially standardise the application of procedures associated.

6.8 Among the amendments, Item 7, Flight Identification now stipulates:
'not exceeding 7 alphanumeric characters and without hyphens or symbols'.

6.9 The amendment indicates the following for airlines would typically apply:
'the ICAO designator for the aircraft operating agency followed by the flight identification (e.g.KLM511, NGA213, JTR25)' reflecting the guidance in Annex 10, Volume II, Chapter 5.

6.10 With the first 3 alphanumeric characters assigned by ICAO to designate the airline operating agency, airlines typically used three numerical characters for flight identification on scheduled flights. The last character was sometimes used for other purposes (e.g. delayed flights) although 4 numerical characters are sometimes used as well, typically for non-scheduled flights.

6.11 The normal combination with 3 numerical characters allows for 1000 scheduled flights (although the number 000 is not used), hence for normal operations 500 return flights. With airlines expanding their operations and several large mergers, the reality is that 1000 flight identifications may not fulfil future needs. While the use of four numerical characters does provide possibilities, this precludes the use of the final character to designate delayed flights or for other purposes (as noted above).

6.12 There was a real possibility that airlines may start using a combination of numbers and characters for flight identification. It was important that this change is noted by States in the planning of their new systems. The United States noted that many of their flights already used seven alphanumeric characters. Australia recognised that using more than seven characters potentially caused problems for systems that utilise FDPS information.

PBN Developments (WP14)

6.13 While Amendment 1 provided for Performance-Based Navigation (PBN) capabilities as identified at the time, the evolution of new capabilities is still on-going. An example is the development of new PBN categories such as 'advanced RNP' which may be available by the time the new format becomes effective.

6.14 Recognising that the design and implementation of new systems to accommodate the published changes was underway, it was important that new development could also be accommodated. ICAO HQ noted that COM/NAV/DAT capabilities not already identified in the FPL format were able to be handled by using Item 10 'Z'. IATA stressed that they preferred an ICAO endorsed global solution that allowed the aircraft capability to be recognised in the FPL without resorting to Item 18 if possible.

Flimsy 01

6.15 Hong Kong, China suggested that it would be useful for flight plan submitters to indicate whether the format was in the NEW format by inserting NEW after indicator RMK/ in Item 18. The meeting saw the merit in this suggestion for the transition, but did not consider that this was viable from a global perspective given the time available. IATA also noted that such information could be 'lost' in the Item 18.

Agenda Item 7: Review and update FPL&AM/TF Task List

7.1 The meeting reviewed the Task List and agreed that the Task List shown as **Appendix E** appropriately represents the current work programme of the Task Force.

Agenda Item 8: Any other business

8.1 The meeting did not identify any other business for discussion.

Agenda Item 9: Date and venue for the next FPL&AM/TF meeting

Next Meeting

9.1 The next meeting was scheduled during the October – November 2011 period, at a specific time and venue to be advised.

Closing of the Meeting

9.2 The Chairman closed the meeting by thanking participants and particularly Mr. Brady for the intensive work and excellent outcomes, which were vital for the effective implementation of FPL 2012.

.....

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

List of Participants

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
1.	AUSTRALIA (4)		
	1. Mr. Warren Beeston	ATM Operational Systems Manager Airservices Australia Locked Bag 747 Eagle Farm 4007 Australia	Tel: +61-7-3866 3720 Fax: +61-7-3866-3833 E-mail: warren.beeston@airservicesaustralia.com
	2. Mr. Con Siagas	Project Manager Airservices Australia Building 4 Tower Road Tullamarine Victoria 3043 Australia	Tel: +61-3-9339 2520 Fax: +61-3-9339 2144 E-mail: con.siagas@airservicesaustralia.com
	3. Mr. Roy Tuomela	AIS Specialist Civil Aviation Safety Authority GPO Box 2005 Canberra ACT 2601 Australia	Tel: +61-2-6217 1421 Fax: +61-2-6217 1500 E-mail: roy.tuomela@casa.gov.au
	4. Sqd.Ldr. Rob Pedder	Staff Officer Operations Support Royal Australian Air Force Headquarters, No. 44 Wing RAAF Base Williamtown New South Wales Australia	Tel: +61-2-4034 7099 Fax: +61-2-4034 7002 E-mail: robert.pedder@defence.gov.au Robin31@aapt.net.au

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
2.	BANGLADESH (2)		
5.	Mr. Md. Rafiqul Islam	Dy Director (Telecom & Ops) Civil Aviation Authority of Bangladesh Headquarters Office Kurmitola Dhaka 1229 Bangladesh	Tel: +880 2 7912366 Fax: +880 2 8913322 E-mail: ddcomops@caab.gov.bd
6.	Mr. Md. Minhaz Uddin Khan	Assistant Manager Flight Operations Control Biman Bangladesh Airlines Ltd. 36/2B Malibagh Chowdhury Para Dhaka-1219 Bangladesh	Tel: +880 172 6673343 Fax: +880 2 8913357 E-mail: minhazkhan2011@gmail.com
3.	CAMBODIA (2)		
7.	Mr. Chhun Sivorn	Deputy Director State Secretariat of Civil Aviation No. 62 Preah Norodom Blvd. Phnom Penh Cambodia	Tel: +855-23-22 42 58 Fax: +855-23-22 42 59 E-mail: ans.ssca@gmail.com
8.	Mr. Sivarak Chutipong	Senior Engineer Cambodia Air Traffic Services Co., Ltd. CATS Bldg. in front of Phnom Penh Int'l Airport Sangkat Kakab, Khan Dang Kor Phnom Penh Cambodia	Tel: +855-15-771138 Fax: +855-23-890214 E-mail: sivarakc@cats.com.kh

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
4.	CHINA (4)		
9.	Mr. Kang Nan	Engineer of ATMB Air Traffic Management Bureau, CAAC No. 12 Zhonglu, Third Ring Road East Chaoyang District Beijing 100022 People's Republic of China	Tel: +86-10-87786815 Fax: +86-10-87786810 E-mail: kangnan@atmb.net.cn
10.	Mr. Liang Yong	Engineer of ATMB Air Traffic Management Bureau, CAAC No. 12 Zhonglu, Third Ring Road East Chaoyang District Beijing 100022 People's Republic of China	Fax: +86-10-87786810 E-mail: liangyong@atmb.net.cn
11.	Mr. Xu You Chen	Engineer of ATMB (ADCC) Air Traffic Management Bureau, CAAC No. 12 Zhonglu, Third Ring Road East Chaoyang District Beijing 100022 People's Republic of China	Fax: +86-10-87786810/82325552 E-mail: xuych@adcc.com.cn
12.	Mr. Yuan Yong	Engineer of ATMB (ADCC) Air Traffic Management Bureau, CAAC No. 12 Zhonglu, Third Ring Road East Chaoyang District Beijing 100022 People's Republic of China	Fax: +86-10-87786810/82325552 E-mail: yuany@adcc.com.cn

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
5.	HONG KONG, CHINA (5)		
13.	Mr. Wong, Wai-choi, Ronald	Senior Electronics Engineer Civil Aviation Department 3/F, Dragonair House, 11 Tung Fai Road Hong Kong International Airport Hong Kong, China	Tel: +852 2591 5330 Fax: +852 2845 7160 E-mail: rwcwong@cad.gov.hk
14.	Ms. Tse Chau-ming, Ginny	AIS Briefing Officer Civil Aviation Department Aeronautical Information Centre ATMD, Air Traffic Control Complex 1 Control Tower Road Hong Kong International Airport Hong Kong, China	Tel: +852-2910 6252 Fax: +852-2910 1180 E-mail: gemtse@cad.gov.hk aic@cad.gov.hk
15.	Mr. Cheung Yik-hong, Colin	Air Traffic Flight Services Officer Civil Aviation Department ATMD Training Unit 3/F, Air Traffic Control Complex Hong Kong International Airport Hong Kong, China	Tel: +852 2910 6856 Fax: +852 2910 0860 E-mail: cyhcheung@cad.gov.hk
16.	Ms. Lee Suk-yea, Angela	Project Officer Civil Aviation Department 3/F, Dragonair House, 11 Tung Fai Road Hong Kong International Airport Hong Kong, China	Tel: +852 2591 5121 Fax: +852 2845 7160 E-mail: asylee@cad.gov.hk;
17.	Ms. Tam Wing-yea, Teresa	Technical Support Officer Civil Aviation Department 3/F, Dragonair House, 11 Tung Fai Road Hong Kong International Airport Hong Kong, China	Tel: +852 2591 5337 Fax: +852 2845 7160 E-mail: twytam@cad.gov.hk

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
6.	FIJI (1)		
	18. Ms. Theresa O'Boyle-Levestam	Air Traffic Management Inspector Civil Aviation Authority of Fiji Private Mail Bag, NAP 0354 Nadi International Airprot Fiji Islands	Tel: +679-672 1555 Fax: +679-672 0261 E-mail: theresa@caafi.org.fj
7.	INDIA (2)		
	19. Mr. Satyajit Dutta	Jt. General Manager (ATM) Airports Authority of India Rajiv Gandhi Bhavan Safdarjung Airport New Delhi 110003 India	Tel: +91 11 2465 8450 Fax: +91 11 2464 5606 E-mail: satyajitdutta1@rediffmail.com sdutta@aai.aero
	20. Mr. Alok Kumar Varshney	Manager (COM) Airports Authority of India Rajiv Gandhi Bhavan Safdarjung Airport New Delhi 110003 India	Tel: +91 11 2461 0851 Fax: +91 11 2469 3963 E-mail: alokkvarshney@aai.aero
8.	INDONESIA (9)		
	21. Ms. Dinni Noerdiani	Deputy Director for AIS Directorate of Air Navigation DGCA, Ministry of Transportation Jl. Medan Merdeka Barat 8 Jakarta 10110 Indonesia	Tel: +(62) 21 3507603, 3516961 Fax: +(62) 21 3507603 E-mail : dinni_n@yahoo.com ais_indonesia@indo.net.id

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
22.	Mr. Farid Wajdi	DGCA, Ministry of Transportation Jl. Medan Merdeka Barat 8 Jakarta 10110 Indonesia	Tel: +62 (21) 3506554 Fax: +62 (21) 3507569 E-mail: farizd_aismap@yahoo.com
23.	Mr. Zainal Arifin Harahap	DGCA, Ministry of Transportation Karya Bldg 23 rd Floor Jl. Medan Merdeka Barat 8 Jakarta 10110 Indonesia	Tel: +62 (21) 3506554 Fax: +62 (21) 3507569 E-mail: cokycok@gmail.com
24.	Mr. Nurhasan	PT. Angkasa Pura II (Persero) 600 Building Soekarno-Hatta International Airport Jakarta Indonesia	Tel: +62 (21) 550 6152 Fax: +62 (21) 550 6106 E-mail: nurhasan_atc61@yahoo.com
25.	Mr. Eko Setiawan	FDO Jnr Mgr 611 Building PT. Angkasa Pura II (Persero) Soekarno-Hatta International Airport Jakarta Indonesia	Tel: +62 (21) 550 6178 Fax: +62 (21) 550 6128 E-mail: bwxx28@yahoo.com
26.	Mr. Riza Fahmi	Assistant Deputy for ATS Quality Assurance PT. Angkasa Pura I (Persero) Kota Baru Bandar Kemayoran Block B-12 Kav No.2 Jakarta 10610 Indonesia	Tel: +62-21-654 1961 ext 2312 Mobile: +62-811 411 071 Fax: +62-21-658 66838 E-mail: r_fahmi@yahoo.com

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
27.	Mrs. Novalina	PT. Angkasa Pura I (Persero) Makkasar Air Traffic Service Centre (MATSC) Jl. Bandara Baru Makassar 90242 Indonesia	Tel: +62 (411) 4813210 ext 2057 Fax: +62 (411) 4813222 E-mail: marathana_ap1@yahoo.co.id
28.	Mr. Agus Heri U	PT. Angkasa Pura I (Persero) Makkasar Air Traffic Service Centre (MATSC) Jl. Bandara Baru Makassar 90242 Indonesia	Tel: +62 (411) 4813210 ext 2060 Fax: +62 (411) 4813222 E-mail: agusheriusianto@yahoo.com
29.	Mr. Wayan Wira Y	BPPT 2 nd Buildings, 21 st Floor Jl. M.H. Thamrin No. 8 Jakarta 10340 Indonesia	Tel: +62 (21) 316 9813 Fax: +62 (21) 316 9811 E-mail: wayan.wira@bppt.go.id
9.	JAPAN (2)		
30.	Mr. Katsuhisa Midorikawa	Special Assistant to the Director ATC Data Systems Office Japan Civil Aviation Bureau Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism 2-1-3, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 100-8918 Japan	Tel: +81-3-5253 8747 Fax: +81-3-5253 1664 E-mail: midorikawa-k07pk@mlit.go.jp

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
	31. Mr. Masamichi Mizutamari	Special Assistant to the Director Operation and Flight Inspection Division Japan Civil Aviation Bureau Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism 2-1-3, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 100-8918 Japan	Tel: +81-3-5253 8751 Fax: +81-3-5253 1664 E-mail: mizutamari-m22h@mlit.go.jp
10.	LAO PDR (1)		
	32. Mr. Khine Simvongsa	Deputy Director Air Navigation Div. P.O. Box 119 Wattay International Airport Vientiane Lao PDR	Tel: +856-21-512164 Fax: +856-21-520237 E-mail: ksimvongsa@yahoo.com
11.	MALAYSIA (6)		
	33. Mr. Mohd Ridewan bin Abdullah	Assistant Director (Airspace) Air Traffic Services Division Department of Civil Aviation Level 1-4, Podium Block, Precinct 4, Lot 494 62570 Putrajaya Malaysia	Tel: +603- 8871 4269 +601- 637 0012 Fax: +603-88810530 E-mail: ridewan@dca.gov.my

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
34.	Mr. Ngai Chee Heng	Ass. Deputy Director KL ATCC Department of Civil Aviation Kuala Lumpur Air Traffic Control Centre Block A, KL ATCC Complex Subang Airport 47200 Subang Selangor Malaysia	Tel: +603 7847 3573/60193128378 Fax: +603 78456590 E-mail: chngai@dca.gov.my
35.	Mr. Mohd Razmin Sham	AIS Maintenance Engineer Department of Civil Aviation Block B, Kompleks Kawalan Trafik Udara Lapangan Terbang Sultan Abdul Aziz Shah 47200 Subang, Selangor Malaysia	Tel: +603 8737 0585 Fax: +603-8734 0585 E-mail: mrazmins@gmail.com
36.	Mr. Hazril Fairiz	AIS Maintenance Engineer Department of Civil Aviation Block B, Kompleks Kawalan Trafik Udara Lapangan Terbang Sultan Abdul Aziz Shah 47200 Subang, Selangor Malaysia	Tel: +603 8737 0585 Fax: +603-8734 0585 E-mail: frez313@gmail.com
37.	Ms. Halimahton Saadiah M'Ros	Maintenance Engineer Air Traffic Management Sector Department of Civil Aviation Level 4, Podium Block B No.27 Persiaran Perdana Precint 4, 62618 Putrajaya Malaysia	Tel: +619 2660037 Fax: +603-5569 2525 E-mail: halimahton@aat.my

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
	38. Ms. Haridah Abbas	Maintenance Engineer Air Traffic Management Sector Department of Civil Aviation Level 4, Podium Block B No.27 Persiaran Perdana Precint 4, 62618 Putrajaya Malaysia	Tel: +619 3688235 Fax: +603-7846 5880 E-mail: haridah@aat.my
12.	MONGOLIA (2)		
	39. Mr. Yondon Erdenebat	ATM Specialist of ANS Civil Aviation Authority of Mongolia Buyant-Ukhaa, MCAA Ulaanbaatar 17120 Mongolia	Tel: +976-11-282011, 99107058 Fax: +976-11-379981 E-mail: yo_erdenebat@mcaa.gov.mn
	40. Mr. Ulemj Davaa	Deputy Director of AIS Mongolia Civil Aviation Authority of Mongolia Chinggis Khaan Int'l Airport Ulaanbaatar 17120 Mongolia	Tel: +976-11-2831329 Fax: +976-11-313157 E-mail: ulemj@mcaa.gov.mn
13.	MYANMAR (2)		
	41. Mr. Than Lwin	Air Traffic Control Officer Air Navigation Safety Division Department of Civil Aviation Headquarters Building Yangon International Airport Mingaladon, Yangon 11021 Myanmar	Tel: +95 (1) 533 008 Fax: +95 (1) 533 016, 665124 E-mail: ats@dca.gov.mm;

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
	42. Mr. Aung Myo	Assistant Engineer (CNS) Communication, Navigation and Surveillance Div Department of Civil Aviation Headquarters Building Yangon International Airport Mingaladon, Yangon 11021 Myanmar	Tel: +95 (1) 533 020 Fax: +95 (1) 533 016, 665124 E-mail: aungmyo.ms@gmail.com
14.	NEW ZEALAND (1)		
	43. Mr. Stuart Douglas	Senior ATS Systems Specialist Airways Corporation of New Zealand Ltd. P. O. Box 14-131 Christchurch New Zealand	Tel: +64-3-358 1629 Fax: +64-3-358 2790 E-mail: stu.douglas@airways.co.nz
15.	PHILIPPINES (2)		
	44. Mr. Charlemagne P. Gilo	Assistant Chief Airways Communicator Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines 4 th Floor, CAAP Building Air Traffic Service MIA Road, Pasay City Philippines	Tel: +632-879-9159 Fax: +632-879-259 E-mail: cpgilo@yahoo.com Charlemagne.gilo@gmail.com
	45. Mr. Necias I. Dayap	Chief Airways Communicator Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines 4 th Floor, CAAP Building Air Traffic Service MIA Road, Pasay City Philippines	Tel: +632-879-9282 Fax: +632-879-9259 E-mail: necias50@yahoo.com

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
16.	REPUBLIC OF KOREA (4)		
	46. Mr. Hong Sungmin	Assistant Director ATM Division Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs 1-8, Byeoryang-dong Gwacheon-si, Gyeonggi-do 427-040 Republic of Korea	Tel: +82-2-2669-6434 Fax: +82-2-6342-7289 E-mail: smhong01@korea.kr
	47. Mr. Jung Hyunghoon	ATC Education Assistant Incheon ACC P.O. Box 26 Incheon Airport Joong-gu, Incheon 400-340 Republic of Korea	Tel: +82-32-880 0235 Fax: +82-32-889 2381 E-mail: wolfholic@korea.kr
	48. Mr. Park Chu Sok	Senior Manager Incheon International Airport Corporation 424-47 Gonghang-gil, Jung-gu Incheon 400-700 Republic of Korea	Tel: +82-32-741 2768 Fax: +82-32-741 2700 E-mail: pcsnet@airport.kr
	49. Mr. Lee Young gil	Radar Control Team/Senior Manager Korea Airports Corporation 150, Gonghang-dong, Gangseo-Gu Seoul, 157-813 Republic of Korea	Tel: +82-2-2660 4832 Fax: +82-2-2660 4800 E-mail: radar7@airport.co.kr

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
17.	SINGAPORE (4)		
	50. Ms. Wong Liang Fen	Chief, Aeronautical Information Services Aeronautical Information Services Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore P.O. Box 1 Singapore Changi Airport Singapore 918141	Tel: +65-6595 6051 Fax: +65-6543 1826 E-mail: wong_liang_fen@caas.gov.sg
	51. Mr. Rengaraju Sundraraj	Chief Flight Services (CFS) Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore 60 Biggin Hill Singapore 509950	Tel: +65-65412433 Fax: +65-65456252 E-mail: r_sundraraj@caas.gov.sg
	52. Mr. Lim Hong Heng	Executive Engineer (Air Traffic Management Systems) Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore P.O. Box 1 Singapore Changi Airport Singapore 918141	Tel: +65-6595 6696 Fax: +65-6542 2447 E-mail: lim_hong_heng@caas.gov.sg
	53. Mr. Chan Tai Khoon	Senior Engineer (Air Traffic Management Systems) Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore P.O. Box 1 Singapore Changi Airport Singapore 918141	Tel: +65-6541 2899 Fax: +65-6542 2447 E-mail: chan_tai_khoon@caas.gov.sg
18.	THAILAND (13)		
	54. Lt.Jg. Yoottakarn Niewpant	Air Traffic Control Specialist Airport Standards Bureau Department of Civil Aviation Tungmahamek Bangkok 10120, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-287 8159 ext 1165 Fax: +66-2-286 8159 E-mail: niewpant@aviation.go.th

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
55.	Mr. Chairat Chookiatyot	Transport Technical Officer, Professional Level Airport Standards Bureau Department of Civil Aviation 71 Soi Ngarmdu-Plee Tungmahamek Bangkok 10120, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-2870320-9 ext 1400 Fax: +66-2-287 4060 E-mail: chairat@aviation.go.th
56.	Capt. Kitikun Kasikum	Manager, Flight Operations Document Control Department Flight Operations Department Thai Airways International Public Company Limited 89 Vibhavadi Rangsit Rd Bangkok 10900, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-545 2996 Fax: +66-2-545 3901 E-mail: kitikun.k@thaiairways.com
57.	Mr. Thanwa Sotawong	Chief, Dispatch Services Group (OW-I) Flight Operations Department Thai Airways International Public Company Limited BKKOW, 4 th Floor OPC Building Suvarnabhumi International Airport Thailand	Tel: +66-2-137 1737 Fax: +66-2-137 1762 E-mail: thanwa.s@thaiairways.com
58.	Mr. Rungruang Burapapanich	Operations Engineer Flight Technical Engineering Department Thai Airways International Public Company Limited 89 Vibhavadi Rangsit Rd Bangkok 10900, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-545 2806 Fax: +66-2-545 3851 E-mail: rungruang.b@thaiairways.com

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
59.	Ms. Krichporn Kuprasert	Operations Engineer Flight Technical Engineering Department Thai Airways International Public Company Limited 89 Vibhavadi Rangsit Rd Bangkok 10900, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-545 2806 Fax: +66-2-545 3851 E-mail: krichporn.k@thaairways.com
60.	Mr. Bunpot Kujaphun	General Administrative Manager Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd 102 Ngamduplee Thungmahamek, Sathorn Bangkok 10120, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-285 9847 Tel: +66-2-285 9848 E-mail: bunpot.ku@aerothai.co.th
61.	Mrs. Jittima Asawachaiporn	General Administrative Manager Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd 102 Ngamduplee Thungmahamek, Sathorn Bangkok 10120, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-285 9082 Fax: +66-2-287 8538 E-mail: jittima.as@aerothai.co.th Tima14@aerothai.co.th
62.	Capt. Tipparat Pakpoomsin	Assistant Flight Dispatch Manager Bangkok Airways Co., Ltd. 2 nd Floor, Bangkok Air Operations Complex 2 999 Mu 4 Bangna-Trad Rd. Bangchalong, Bangplee Samuthprakarn 10540, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-328 3311 Fax: +66-2-325 0664 E-mail: tipparat@bangkokair.com
63.	Mr. Pakdee Dangkasarn	Chief of Flight Dispatch Bangkok Airways Co., Ltd. 2 nd Floor, Bangkok Air Operations Complex 2 999 Mu 4 Bangna-Trad Rd. Bangchalong, Bangplee Samuthprakarn 10540, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-328 3314 Fax: +66-2-328 3319 E-mail: pakdee@bangkokair.com

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
	64. Mr. Pakorn Kamtarat	Flight Dispatch and Operations Officer Nok Airlines Company Limited 3 rd Floor, Domestic Terminal, Room No. 3635 Donmuang International Airport Sikan, Donmuang Bangkok 10210, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-535 6690, 535 6697 Fax: +66-2-535 6339 E-mail: pakorn.kam@nokair.com
	65. Ms. Kananuch Wichitnark	Flight Dispatch and Operations Officer Nok Airlines Company Limited Donmuang Airport, Room No. 3635 Fl.3 Seekan, Donmuang Bangkok 10210, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-535 6690, 535 6697 Fax: +66-2-535 6339 E-mail: kananuch.wic@nokair.com
	66. Mr. Widodo D. Prasetyo	Flight Engineer B747/FLT OPS QA Manager Orient-Thai Airlines Co., Ltd. 222 Room 3602 Donmuang Int'l Airport Domestic Terminal, Vipavadee-Rungsit Rd Srikan, Donmuang Bangkok, 10210, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-535 7166 +66851430747 Fax: +66-2-504 3227 E-mail: widododp@yahoo.com qa_ftops1@orient-thai.com
19.	UNITED STATES (2)		
	67. Mr. Ray Ahlberg	En Route and Oceanic Services Technical Performance Support Group Federal Aviation Administration 600 Independence Avenue, SW Washington, D.C. U.S.A.	Tel: +1-202-385 8290 E-mail: ray.ahlberg@faa.gov
	68. Mr. Brian Bagstad	Air Traffic Representative, Asia Pacific Group FAA Air Traffic Organization US Embassy Singapore 27 Napier Road Singapore 258508	Tel: +65-6476 9462 E-mail: brian.bagstad@faa.gov

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
20.	VIET NAM (8)		
	69. Mrs. Ho Thi Doan Trang	ATS Officer Air Navigation Department Civil Aviation Authority of Viet Nam 119 Nguyen Son Street Long Bien District Ha Noi, Viet Nam	Tel: +84-4-38723 600 Fax: +84-4-38274 194 E-mail: hodoantrang@caa.gov.vn
	70. Mr. Nguyen Tien Giang	Deputy Manager Air Safety Division ATS Department Vietnam Air Traffic Management (VATM) Ha Noi, Viet Nam	Tel: +84-988569968 E-mail: ntgiang@vatm.vn
	71. Mrs. Ngo Thi Thuy Van	Manager of AIP/MAP/CHARTS AIS Center Viet Nam Air Traffic Management Ha Noi Viet Nam	Tel: +84-4-38728521 Fax : +84-4-38725687 E-mail: ngothithuyvan@hotmail.com
	72. Mrs. Duong Thi Nhan	Manager, ARO Unit Southern Airport Cooperation Viet Nam	Tel: +84-8-38485383-3368 Fax : +84-8-38422143 E-mail: nhan20_5@yahoo.com
	73. Mrs. Nguyen Thi Thanh Nga	Manager, Ground Control Unit Southern Airport Cooperation Viet Nam	Tel: +84-8-38485383-3227 E-mail: thanhnga6862@yahoo.com
	74. Mrs. Vo Thi Tram Anh	Manager, ARO-GCU Unit Middle Airport Cooperation Danang International Airport Danang City Viet Nam	Tel: +84-913-443555 Fax : +84-511-3614341/3614670 E-mail: ta_hoanglan@yahoo.com

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
	75. Mrs. Nguyen Thi Thu Huong	Supervisor ARO/AIS Northern Airport Cooperation Noi Bai International Airport Hanoi Viet Nam	Tel: +84-8865352 / +84904340975 Fax: +84-4-35844306 E-mail: thuhuongaro@yahoo.com
	76. Mr. Phan Huu Son	Flight Dispatch Supervisor Operation Control Centre Vietnam Airlines Ha Noi, Viet Nam	Tel: +84-4-38720884 Fax: +84-4-38272916 E-mail: sonph.occ@vietnamair.com.vn
21.	IATA (7)		
	77. Mr. Geoff Hounsell	Assistant Director Safety, Operations & Infrastructure International Air Transport Association 111 Somerset Road, #14-05 Somerset Wing Singapore Power Building Singapore 238164	Tel: +65 64992253 Fax: +65 62339286 e-mail: hounsellg@iata.org
	78. Mr. Chao-Jen Chen	Flight Dispatcher IATA Asia/Pacific #14-05, Triple One, Somerset Wing Singapore Power Building Singapore 238164	Tel: +65 64992253 Fax: +65 62339286
	79. Mr. Chao-Feng Chen	Flight Dispatcher IATA Asia/Pacific #14-05, Triple One, Somerset Wing Singapore Power Building Singapore 238164	Tel: +65 64992253 Fax: +65 62339286

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
80.	Mr. Owen Dell	Manager International Operations Cathay Pacific Airways Ltd. International Operations 9/F Central Tower, Cathay Pacific City 8 Scenic Road Hong Kong International Airport Hong Kong, China	Tel: +852-2747 8829 Fax: +852-2141 8829 E-mail: owen_dell@cathaypacific.com
81.	Mr. Julian Fung	Assistant Manager International Operations Cathay Pacific Airways Ltd. International Operations Cathay Pacific City 8 Scenic Road Hong Kong International Airport Hong Kong, China	Tel: +852-2747 3818 Fax: +852-2141 3818 E-mail: julian_fung@cathaypacific.com
82.	Mr. George Chan	Assistant Manager International Operations Cathay Pacific Airways Ltd. International Operations Cathay Pacific City 8 Scenic Road Hong Kong International Airport Hong Kong, China	Tel: +852-2747 8822 Fax: +852-2141 8822 E-mail: george_g_chan@cathaypacific.com
83.	Mr. Taha Ahmad Bahloq	Aeronautical Services Superintendent Emirate Airline P.O. Box 686 Dubai United Arab Emirates	Tel: +9714 7084310 Fax: +9714 2864317 E-mail: taha.bahloq@emirates.com

FPL&AM/TF/4 & Seminar
Appendix A to the Report

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
22.	IFATCA (1)		
	84. Mr. John Wagstaff	IFATCA Representative c/o ATMD/CAD, ATCX 1 Control Tower Rd. Hong Kong International Airport Hong Kong, China	Tel: +852-2910 6453 Fax: +852-2910 0186 E-mail: john.wags@gmail.com
23.	ICAO		
	85. Mr. Tom Brady	Consultant Air Traffic Management Section ICAO Headquarters Montreal, Canada	E-mail: tbrady@icao.int
	86. Mr. Len Wicks	Regional Officer, ATM ICAO Asia & Pacific Office 252/1 Vibhavadi Rangsit Road Ladyao, Chatuchak Bangkok 10900 Thailand	Tel: 66-2-5378189 ext 152 Fax: 66-2-5378199 E-mail: lwicks@bangkok.icao.int

LIST OF WORKING PAPERS (WPs), INFORMATION PAPERS (IPs) and FLIMSY

WORKING PAPERS

NUMBER	AGENDA	TITLE	PRESENTED BY
WP/1	1	Provisional Agenda	Secretariat
WP/2	5	Doc 7030 Regional Supplementary Procedures Amendment	Secretariat
WP/3	7	Task List for the FPL&AM Task Force	Secretariat
WP/4	5	Observations of Amendment 1 and Considerations in Flight Plan Format Analysis	Hong Kong, China
WP/5	5	Coordination for the Transition to the NEW Flight Plan Format	Secretariat
WP/6	3	Review Report APANPIRG/21	Secretariat
WP/7	6	Example Aeronautical Information Circular for 2012 ICAO FPL	Australia
WP/8	6	Flight Plan Implementation Tracking System Update	Secretariat
WP/9	5	Use of the New Reasons for Special Handling	United States
WP/10	5	Equipment, Capability and Standards	United States
WP/11	5	Interpretation of Certain Field 10b Capabilities	United States
WP/12	5	Handling of Non-Standard Field 18 Information	United States
WP/13	6	Flight Identification and Designators	IATA
WP/14	6	PBN Developments	IATA
WP/15	6	Field 18 – RMK	IATA
WP/16	4	APAC Guidance Material Editorials and Suggested Amendments	Australia
WP/17	5	Airline Readiness	IATA
WP/18	5	FPL 2012 Quarterly Questionnaire	Secretariat

INFORMATION PAPERS

NUMBER	AGENDA	TITLE	PRESENTED BY
IP/1	-	List of Working Papers (WPs) and Information Papers (IPs)	Secretariat
IP/2	5	Implementation Plan of the NEW ICAO Flight Plan and Associated ATS Update Messages in Singapore	Singapore
IP/3	5	New Zealand Implementation Progress	New Zealand
IP/4	6	Australian Flight Plan Processing Assumptions for 2012 Transition	Australia

FPL&AM/TF/4
Appendix B to the Report

NUMBER	AGENDA	TITLE	PRESENTED BY
IP/5	3	Air Navigation Commission Review of Supplementary Requirements	Secretariat
IP/6	5	Implementation Plan of ICAO NEW Flight Plan Format and ATS Messages in Indonesia	Indonesia
IP/7	5	Implementation Plan of the NEW ICAO Flight Plan and Associated ATS Update Messages in Malaysia	Malaysia
IP/8	5	Status of Implementation in India	India
IP/9	5	Creation of a Multi-Regional Filed Flight Plan (FPL) Coordination Group	United States
IP/10	5	Bangladesh Implementation Details	Bangladesh

FLIMSY

NUMBER	AGENDA	TITLE	PRESENTED BY
1	6	Excerpt from ICAO EUR Region Plan for Implementation of Amendment 1 to the 15 th edition of the PANS-ATM Document	Secretariat

.....

**INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION
ASIA AND PACIFIC OFFICE**

ICAO NEW FPL FORMAT SEMINAR
(Bangkok, Thailand, 30 May to 03 June 2011)

SEMINAR PROGRAMME

Monday, 30 May 2011		
TIME	SUBJECT	PRESENTER
0900-1000	Opening of the Seminar Group Photo	Len Wicks, ICAO APAC
1000-1030	<i>Break</i>	
SESSION 1	Detailed Implementation Plans	
1030-1100	Implementation Schedule Phases in Detail	Tom Brady, ICAOHQs
1100-1200	Follow-up of Activities developed by APAC States based on their National Action Plan	APAC States
1200-1330	<i>Lunch</i>	
SESSION 2	Transition	
1330-1400	Transition Entry Criteria, Transition Planning and De-Conflicting of Transitions. Produce a “Change” Model for States that have Manual Flight Plan Systems	Tom Brady, ICAOHQs
SESSION 3	Transport Media	
1400-1430	AFTN/AMHS AIDC Other Interfaces	Tom Brady, ICAOHQs
SESSION 4	Testing	
1430-1500	Discussion on Facility Testing (Factory, Offline, Training/Support System and Operational), adjacent FIR Tests, adjacent Regional Test and Oceanic Test	Tom Brady, ICAOHQs

Tuesday, 31 May 2011		
TIME	SUBJECT	PRESENTER
SESSION 5	Vendors and Stakeholders	
0900-0930	Industry Activity on the Implementation of the NEW Flight Plan Format (including latest contract dates)	TBA
0930-1000	Discussion about Activities that States have made with Stakeholders (General Aviation, Securities Agency, Military, Airline and Airport and Flight Plan Filing Agency)	ICAO, States and Airspace Users
1000-1030	<i>Break</i>	
SESSION 6	Documentation	
1030-1200	Analysis of the Documentation to be updated in reference to the NEW Flight Plan Format Discussion on the Documentation to be updated: AIP, SUPPs, Controller Manual of Operations, Flight Data Handling (ANSP), Operator Manual, Dispatcher Manual, Airport Documentation, System and Training Manual	Tom Brady, ICAOHQs ICAO, States and Airspace Users
1200-1330	<i>Lunch</i>	
SESSION 7	Safety Assurances	
1330-1400	Safety Assurance in the Implementation of the NEW Flight Plan in the APAC Region Consideration for Transition Safety and Transition Hazard Identification (HAZID)	Tom Brady, ICAOHQs
SESSION 8	Training Templates	
1400-1500	Discussion on Training Template for ATC, FPL Handling Staff, Aircrew and Dispatchers	Tom Brady, ICAO

Wednesday, 1 June 2011		
TIME	SUBJECT	PRESENTER
SESSION 9	Spreading the Message	
0900-1000	<p>How to use the FITS</p> <p>ICAO in conjunction with the APAC States will proceed to update the FITS – live internet demo</p> <p>Regional Management Meetings, Aviation Community Conventions</p> <p>Distribution of Leaflets/Handouts and Poster related to the NEW Flight Plan Implementation</p>	Len Wicks, ICAO APAC
1000-1030	<i>Break</i>	
SESSION 10	Finance	
1030-1100	Discussion about the Internal and External Financial Funds for the Implementation of the NEW Flight Plan	Tom Brady, ICAOHQs
SESSION 11	Strategic Support Teams	
1100-1200	<p>ANSP Micro Management</p> <p>Regional Membership</p> <p>Tool Kit</p>	Tom Brady, ICAOHQs
1200-1215	Seminar Closing	Len Wicks, ICAO APAC
1215-1330	<i>Lunch</i>	

.....

FPL&AM/TF/4
Appendix D to the Report

Appendix D: Quarterly Questionnaire

1. APAC FPL 2012 SOFTWARE QUESTIONNAIRE		Remarks
State/Administration		
Flight Information region (s)		
1. Has a FPL 2012 cost and resource capability assessment been conducted?		
2. Has the FPL 2012 Safety Assessment commenced?		
2a. If yes, what Safety Assessment step has been reached?		
3. What other major changes to the ATM system are also being made?		
4. Which agency is developing the FPL 2012 software?		
5. What stage is the software development?		
6. If a software vendor is contracted, advise which vendor?		
7. Is your State using a front end converter?		
7a. If yes, when is the converter going to be replaced by a FPL 2012 compliant FDPS?		
8. When will the internal testing commence and when is it expected to be completed?		
9. When will testing be able to be conducted with other ANSPs?		
10. When will testing start with airlines/operators?		

FPL&AM/TF/4
Appendix E to the Report

FPL&AM TF - TASK LIST

(last amended FPL&AM/TF/4, June 2011)

ID	Task Name	Start Date	Finish Date	Completion Date	Resource Names/Remarks
1.0	PANS-ATM				
1.1	Review of Amendment 1 to PANS-ATM	17 Mar 09	17 Mar 09	20 Mar 09	
1.2	Clarification request to ICAO headquarters			20 NOV 09	
1.3	IATA to study the eligibility in the equipment listing of Item 10 – only file parameters that relate to flight to destination and alternate destination			2 JUN 11	IATA
1.4	Study the sequencing in the Item 10			2 JUN 11	FITS Issue A5
1.5	IATA to study whether the 16 character limitation in PBN/ in Item 18 is sufficient			2 JUN 11	FITS Issue A2
1.6	Study on the suitability of deriving regional character limitations in other fields and sub-field				
1.7	State survey of local peculiarities including the DOF use			2 JUN 11	
1.8	RPL management – include equipment field			2 JUN 11	FITS Issue A8
2.0	Regional Transition Strategies				
2.1	Review of the “guidance for implementation of flight plan information to support Amendment 1”	17 Mar 09	NOV 11		
2.2	Preparation of coordinated Asia/Pacific transition strategies and plans	<u>17 Mar 09</u>	NOV 11		
2.3	Adoption of the Strategy by APANPIRG	<u>11 Sep 09</u>	<u>11 Sep 09</u>	2 JUN 11	
2.4	IATA to inform TF/2 about details of transition arrangements			20 NOV 09	
2.5	Regional Office to relay details of IATA transition arrangements			20 NOV 09	
3.0	AIDC				
3.1	Identification of impact on AIDC operations			2 JUN 11	
3.2	Update of AIDC ICD			2 JUN 11	IMG progressing these changes

FPL&AM/TF/4
Appendix E to the Report

ID	Task Name	Start Date	Finish Date	Completion Date	Resource Names/Remarks
4.0	Contingency Planning				
4.1	Preparation of contingency strategies	<u>Q1 2012</u>			
5.0	Website				
5.1	Update information on State capability PRESENT/NEW status in the ICAO website	<u>1 Jul 11</u>	<u>Ongoing</u>		Quarterly Review questionnaire will be expected to update FITS website
6.0	AIS				
6.1	Publication of AIC			2 JUN 11	WP07 discussed TF4, State responsibility
6.2	Amendment of AIP, if necessary			2 JUN 11	State responsibility
6.3	Trigger NOTAM			2 JUN 11	State responsibility
7.0	Studies of Operational Impact				
7.1	Study on implications for presentation formats including the electronic flight progress strip.			20 MAY 11	State Letter T3/10.1.20-AP039/11 (ATM) surveyed States on impact on affected systems
7.2	Study on impacts to users (flight planning systems, etc)			20 MAY 11	State Letter T3/10.1.20-AP039/11 (ATM) surveyed States on impact on affected systems
7.3	Issues regarding ETD and EOBT		<u>Ongoing</u>		Investigation of effects by IATA
8.0	Regional Supplementary Procedures				
8.1	Amendment of SUPPS			2 JUN 11	WP02 TF4
9.0	Performance Framework Form (PFF)				
9.1	Review and update of the PFF	17 Mar 09	<u>Ongoing</u>		
10.0	Perform System Verifications				
10.2	Conduct of the flight plan trial, support from IATA		<u>Ongoing</u>		Phase 3 Implementation Plan. Further discussion to develop generic test plan.
10.3	Identify problems and solutions		<u>Ongoing</u>		
10.4	Follow-up actions		<u>Ongoing</u>		
11.0	Rulemaking (if necessary)				
11.1	Review of State regulatory documentation			2 JUN 11	TF4 Seminar reminder
11.2	Review of letters of agreement			2 JUN 11	TF4 Seminar reminder
12.0	Training/Education				
12.1	Regional Seminar			2 JUN 11	TF4 Seminar
12.2	Promulgate information to controllers and AIS			2 JUN 11	TF4 Seminar
12.3	Training for dispatchers/pilots/controllers			2 JUN 11	TF4 Seminar

FPL&AM/TF/4
Appendix E to the Report

ID	Task Name	Start Date	Finish Date	Completion Date	Resource Names/Remarks
12.4	FPL 2012 Training Template		31 DEC 11		Australia, review by NZ, US, Japan, China
13.0	Implementation				
13.1	Adaptation of automation and software to NEW		Ongoing		Reviewing progress on FITS
13.2	Post-adaptation verification		Ongoing		
13.3	Ensure no local peculiarities or deviations in the Regions		Ongoing		
13.4	State to notify ICAO of the implementation of NEW		Ongoing		
13.5	Keeping PRESENT until 15 November 2012		15 NOV 12		
14.0	Post-implementation				
14.1	Ceasing PRESENT		16 Nov 12		
14.2	Review of the post-implementation status			2 JUN 11	Planned by ICAO HQ, not a TF function
15.0	Coordination				
15.1	Election of the Chairperson			2 JUN 11	TF3
15.2	Coordinate with ATN ICG			2 JUN 11	
15.3	Liaison by ANSPs with defence authorities			2 JUN 11	State responsibility
15.4	Report to ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/19			2 JUN 11	
15.5	Report to CNS/MET/SG/13			2 JUN 11	
15.6	Report to APANPIRG/20			2 JUN 11	
15.7	Task Force/1	17 Mar 09	20 Mar 09	20 MAR 09	
15.8	Seminar and Task Force/2	10 Nov 09		20 NOV 09	
15.9	Task Force/3			24 AUG 10	
15.10	Task Force/4			2 JUN 11	
15.11	Task Force/5				
15.12	APAC Flight Plan Ad-hoc Working Group		Ongoing		
15.13	Strategic Support Team assistance		Ongoing		
15.14	Clarification of terms and application of Amendment 1		31 DEC 11		ICAO HQ, contact group