



International Civil Aviation Organization

**The Fourth Meeting of the Asia/Pacific ICAO Flight Plan and ATS Messages
Implementation Task Force (FPL&AM/TF/4)**

Bangkok, Thailand, 2 – 3 June 2011

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

Handling of Non-Standard Field 18 Information

(Presented by the United States of America)

SUMMARY

In implementing the Amendment 1 changes, some questions were raised regarding the best approach to handling non-standard Field 18 information.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 There are several instructions for Field 18 that suggest a practice but do not seem to absolutely require it. As we have worked with filers and with system owners there have been some questions raised.
 - 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.”*
 - 1.1.3 The first note leaves open what might happen if a non-standard indicator is encountered. Also, in light of recent discussions regarding existing non-standard indicators such as RVR/ and RFP/, a distinction may have to be made between non-standard indicators published in an Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) or a Regional Supplemental Procedure may and an indicators that are unknown. The material in Section 5.6 of “Asia/Pacific Guidance Material for the Implementation of Amendment 1 to the 15th Edition of the Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Air Traffic Management” should be revisited in light of this new information.
 - 1.1.4 Similarly, the expected reaction to an oblique stroke that is not part of an indicator is not defined.

2. DISCUSSION

Use of Indicators defined in Aeronautical Information Publications (AIPs) or Regional Supplementary Procedures (SUPPs)

2.1 It appears that it will continue to be permissible to define non-standard Field 18 indicators in AIPs and SUPPs. This means that the approach outlined in Section 5.6 of the APAC guidance needs to be reconsidered:

“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.”

2.2 Ideally, systems should be able to recognize known, published non-standard indicators. If that is not possible for some automation systems, guidance for handling the situation is needed.

Use of completely unknown Indicators

2.3 It appears that the existing guidance in Section 5.6 of the guidance document remains satisfactory.

2.4 Note that some FAA systems will initially accept a flight plan with an unknown indicator, remove the oblique stroke, and add the information to RMK/. We still plan to evolve to eventually reject a flight plan with an unknown indicator.

Use of the Oblique Stroke in Field 18 (other than as part of an indicator)

2.5 Per Amendment 1, an oblique stroke should be used in Field 18 only as defined within the specification. However it is not clear what should be done if when it is not used that way.

2.6 If the oblique stroke is preceded by 1 to 4 letters, the FAA assumes it is intended as part of an indicator, and is handled as described in the above discussions.

2.7 If the oblique stroke is not part of an indicator, it likely was used as punctuation in free text. Examples of what has been seen include:

10/09/2010 (date)

ETOPS 120MI NS/O850NM RULE (punctuation)

. . 3724/O7731. . (lat/lon)

2.8 The APAC guidance document 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.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

- 3.1 The meeting is invited to
 - a) Take note of the information in the paper,
 - b) Agree on a recommended approach and
 - c) Update the APAC guidance as appropriate.

.....