



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization  
North American, Central American and Caribbean Office

WORKING PAPER

FPL/AD/MON — WP/12  
23/02/2015

**FPL Ad hoc Group Missing/duplicated/erroneous Filed flight plan /Flight plan (FPL) evaluation meeting (FPL/AD/MON)**

Mexico City, Mexico, 24-26 February 2015

**Agenda Item 3: Review of the measures adopted for mitigation of errors**

**Jamaica's FPL Problem Mitigation/Resolution in Kingston FIR**

(Presented by POC Jamaica)

| <b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| This paper reports on the activities undertaken to collect the relevant data associated flight plan issues and to provide/indicate what actions will be taken to deal with the issues that have arisen. |  |
| <b>Action:</b>  | Section 4  |
| <i>Strategic Objectives:</i>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Safety</li><li>• Air Navigation Capacity and Efficiency</li><li>• Environmental Protection</li></ul>   |
| <i>References:</i>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The collection of FPL data from 21st July to 28th August 2014</li><li>• Minutes of 1<sup>st</sup> FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference - 09 July, 2014</li><li>• Minutes of 2<sup>nd</sup> FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference 29 July, 2014</li><li>• Minutes of 3<sup>rd</sup> FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference 05 September 2014</li><li>• Minutes of 4<sup>th</sup> FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference 20 October, 2014</li><li>• Minutes of 5<sup>th</sup> FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference 05 November, 2014</li><li>• ICAO recommended actions to mitigate FPL errors</li></ul> |

**1. Introduction**

1.1 In an effort to identify and resolve/mitigate problems that may have arisen following the implementation of the new flight plan format in 2012 the FPL Ad hoc Group were mandated to provide information on the actions taken to resolve these flight plan issues. Jamaica being a member of the FPL Ad hoc Group sought to identify the problems associated with the information collected. As you may be aware Grand Cayman is located in the Kingston FIR. However they have their own flight planning system and are responsible for the provision of flight plans in Cayman. As a result a minimal amount of coordination was required with them.

1.2 Based on the action plan the following activities were conducted:

- a) Efforts were made to examine the flight plans received at the respective units in order to retrieve the required data.
- b) Based on the outcome of those exercises/activities certain inadequacies/challenges were identified.
- c) Decisions were taken with regard to how these deficiencies would be dealt with.

## **2 Discussion**

2.1 Jamaica currently has an AMHS platform in operation. Submitted flight plans are converted from the old format for receipt by the AUTOTRAC Automation system which is not compliant with the new Flight plan requirements. We worked during the implementation of the new flight plan format to customize the converter system to address issues of lines 10a/b and 18 where the automation system would reject the new flight plan format. This work significantly reduced errors in processing flight plans for input to the automation system.

2.2 Jamaica was not able to collect data on incoming flight plans due to the following:

- a) All units except the AIS had access to incoming flight plans. This issue was corrected after problems with outgoing flight plans were identified.
- b) Currently AIS is faced with staff challenges, it was not possible to assign any staff member to perform this task. The AIS staff was asked to examine and identify possible affected FPL's. Very little feedback was received.
- c) There were incidences of missing flight plans – FPL's which was destined for a particular aerodrome received by the aerodrome but not by the KATCC.
- d) Checks made with the Grand Cayman (AIS unit) indicated some degree of manual handling because the system does not have all the required features. Where errors were identified the respective airlines were instructed to re-file the flight plan.

2.3 It should be noted that Jamaica receives flights plans mostly via Fax and some via AMHS. In the case of rejected flight plans this had to do with those that were sent to other FIRs by the AIS unit.

2.4 Although there was a difficulty in identifying the specific flight plan issues with respect to incoming flight plans, the issues could be identified with flight plans submitted to AIS. Issues identified include:

- a) Errors relating to items 10a, 10b and corresponding field 18
- b) Incorrect ATS route errors for FIRs outside of Kingston FIR

2.5 These were as a result of the following:

- a) Carelessness on the part of some AIS personnel.
- b) Lack of knowledge of equipment on-board aircraft and also PBN capabilities.
- c) Pilots unaware of the new flight plan 2012 format.
- d) Little or no training of staff in handling agencies/FBO that accepts and submit flight plans to the AIS.

### **3. Proposed actions**

3.1 The following actions will be undertaken:

- a) Continuous monitoring of the AMHS system to facilitate the identification of FPL errors/inconsistencies.
- b) Refresher training for AIS staff.
- c) Hire/train more staff to address the staff challenges in the AIS.
- d) Training for staff of the relevant agencies which submit flight plans to AIS.
- e) Discontinue use of RPLs. This has been reduced somewhat.
- f) Look at the issue of the media via which FPLs are submitted. Identified that most errors identified in the FPL's were those submitted via fax. Also some of the agencies using this medium do not provide proper contact numbers.
- g) Review existing LOAs and update where necessary.

### **4 Suggested Action**

4.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this working paper, and
- b) take any action as deemed necessary

- END -