



*International Civil Aviation Organization*

NORTH AMERICAN, CENTRAL AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN OFFICE

**Twentieth Meeting of Directors of Civil Aviation of the Eastern Caribbean (20<sup>th</sup> E/CAR DCA)**

Miami, Florida, United States, 4 to 7 December 2006

---

**Agenda Item: 3                      Air Navigation Matters**

3.1                      Complement of the conclusions of the 30<sup>th</sup> ECWG report

**Repetitive Flight plan processing in the E/CAR**

(Presented by FRANCE)

<p><b>SUMMARY</b></p>
<p>This working paper aims at the common approbation by the of a regional processing of Repetitive Flight Plans (RPL) in the E/CAR</p>
<p><b>References:</b></p>
<p>Pans/ATM (Doc 4444, §16.4.1.2)</p>

**1 Introduction**

1.1        At the 20<sup>th</sup> ECWG, France presented WP 16 that was dealing with the problem of missing Flight plans on the control positions.

1.2        During the discussions of the AIS ad hoc group held between the plenary sessions, a regional method for the processing of the RPLs was agreed upon.

Unfortunately, the report of the 30<sup>th</sup> does not present any conclusion to be endorsed by the DCA, since there is an urgency to agree and implement a commonly agreed processing.

1.3        This WP aims at the adoption by the E/CAR DCAs of such a method.

## 2 Discussion

### 2.1. Establishment of the causes

In order to assess precisely the different types of failures and to define an action plan to solve the problems efficiently, the French ANSP launched an analysis on flight plans availability in 2005.

The analysis of 10 days of traffic did establish that the majority of missing flight plans were not shown on the controller position because of the following causes:

2.1.1. Missing addresses: The French sites are not addressed with the messages for the flights crossing their airspace. This is the main reason for missing flight plans. Piarco identified that some senders only address the flight plans to Piarco ACC but not to all of the other concerned ATC units.

2.1.2. Ineffective management of Repetitive Flight Plans (RPL): The processing presently done doesn't result in the adequate dissemination of RPLs.

2.1.3. Flight plans received but not forwarded to the controllers. This may occur with flight plans with incorrect syntax and that can't be automatically managed by our FDPS (flight plan data processor system).

2.1.4. Flight plans sent after the actual departure time of the flight.

2.1.5. AFTN link unserviceable.

### 2.2. Remedial actions

2.2.1. Concerning the missing addresses, Piarco AIS Office, after coordinating with the ECAR partners, published an update of the E/CAR AIP in order to detail the different addresses to be used for traffic transiting and landing in the different TMAs/CTRs of its FIR.

Furthermore, France did address alerting letters to ICAO NACC office, the E/CAR ANSPs and IATA, in order for them to verify and possibly to correct the procedures in use by their respective personnel or affiliates. The latter organization advised of the transmission of the request to IATAS members.

2.2.2. In reference to RPL processing in the E/CAR, the AIS ad hoc group of the ECWG discussions established that

- Some E/CAR operators need to use RPLs.
- §16.4.1.2 of Pans/ATM (Doc 4444) states that for international flights, bilateral, multilateral or regional agreements are requested.
- No agreement is presently in force in E/CAR region

In order to satisfy the needs of the user and in the same time provide an adequate service, this ad hoc group agreed to propose the following simple principle :

**In the E/CAR, each DEPARTING aerodrome is responsible for the daily dissemination of RPL to ALL addressees requested by ICAO standards:**

As a consequence the following conclusion is proposed for the approbation of the E/CAR DCAs:

**DRAFT**

**CONCLUSION 20/XX Common procedure for RPLs management in the E/CAR**

That,

- a) E/CAR States/Territories//International Organizations accepting the use of RPLs for traffic departing from aerodromes under its jurisdiction, shall implement a common procedure in order to ensure the appropriate dissemination of the RPLs data
- b) The concerned procedures shall be published in the ECAR AIPs.
- c) In the E/CAR this procedure is based on the following principles:
  - Users shall transmit their list of RPLs to each departing aerodrome.
  - Each departing aerodrome AIS office that is accepting the use of RPL for departing traffic, shall daily transmit the flight plan data to each and all the concerned ATC facilities according to ICAO dissemination standards.
- d) A follow-up of the rapid implementation of the present decision will be made by the 31<sup>st</sup> ECWG.

2.2.3. FPL Syntax

Concerning flight plans not complying with ICAO syntax, the aim is to obtain respect the ICAO standards. For that it is proposed that each DCA offer the appropriate refresher training to its AIS officer and also that “intelligent” tools (i.e input frames) be implemented so that the data introduced on the AFTN respect the correct ICAO format and facilitate the proper addressing of AFTN messages.

As a consequence the following conclusion is proposed for the approbation of the E/CAR DCAs:

**DRAFT**

**CONCLUSION 20/XX Implementation of “intelligent” AIS tools**

That, the implementation of automated ‘intelligent’ tools be considered to facilitate the correct edition and addressing of AFTN messages in the E/CAR facilities.

2.2.4. As it has been reminded by the AIS ad hoc group, all IFR traffic shall take off with a FPL. In consequence it was repeated that NO reasons or excuses shall be accepted to leave any departure without the actual reception of the flight plan. It is proposed that appropriate reminding be made to ATC officers for a RIGOUROUS respect.

2.2.5. Concerning the AFTN network failure, the Ad hoc group considered the Piarco Telecommunication system improvement Plan and agreed for the follow-up of the progresses of its implementation.

### **3 Suggested action**

3.1 The meeting is invited to consider and discuss the information provided in this WP and to adopt the conclusions as proposed in paragraphs 2.2.2 and 2.2.3:

-----