



ICAO

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

DISCUSSION PAPER

ANI/WG/4 — DP/04  
23/08/18

**Fourth NAM/CAR Air Navigation Implementation Working Group Meeting (ANI/WG/4)**  
Miami, United States, 21 – 24 August 2018

**Agenda Item 4: Follow-up, Performance Evaluation and Monitoring of the CAR Regional Performance Based Air Navigation Implementation Plan**  
**4.1 Progress Reports of the Task Forces of the ANI WG**

**AIDC TASK FORCE PROGRESS REPORT**  
(Presented by the AIDC/TF Rapporteur)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This discussion paper presents the issues discussed by the AIDC task force and FPL Monitoring Group members during the ANI/WG/4 meeting.

*Strategic Objectives:*

- Safety
- Air Navigation Capacity and Efficiency

**1. Introduction**

1.1 During the ANI/WG/4 meeting, the members of the task force participate in a breakout session to discuss items of interest. This discussion paper describes the issues treated.

**2. Discussion**

2.1 The membership of the AIDC and FPL monitoring group was updated, as can be seen in Appendix B to Working Paper 10.

2.1.1 The rapporteur was made aware of the availability of documents developed by CANSO that could serve as guidance for the implementation of AIDC and also as guidance for flight plan processing. These documents will be reviewed and the links made available to members of the task forces.

2.1.2 There was a discussion with Jamaica regarding their recent implementation of an ATC system and their AIDC tests via a test bed. It was indicated that flight plan errors were treated at a designated position of the ATC system that handles the error queue, but by personnel trained for the purpose, not controllers. The importance of feedback to the airspace user was brought to their attention, as also the existence of the filers PoC list in the task force web page as aid to contact the airlines. Also a review of the system's static database was suggested, as this can be the source of errors. This was taken into account by the representatives of Jamaica.

2.1.3 During the discussion with Jamaica, very important issues were brought up:

- a) The possibility of having a previous check of flight plan data before it is used by the control centre. In some cases, the flight plan goes directly to the ATC system, as in the case of Jamaica. In this case, there should be dedicated personnel following up on the errors in flight plans, again giving feedback to the airlines.
- b) There is discrepancy on what should be done by the airspace user when an error is notified, if a modification or replacement should be sent only to the FIR that submitted the error or all FIRs involved. On the one side Document 4444 indicates that CHG messages be only sent to those FIRs that are affected by the CHG, and on the other side to always send the CHG message to all FIRs to ensure that every FIR has exactly the same information. In the end the net effect is the same, but a unique criteria should be adopted.
- c) The possibility of airspace users implementing the RQS message for FIRs to obtain supplemental flight plan data was put on the table was discussed as an alternative to the current methods, in order to facilitate getting this information in the case of any emergency: the procedure will in all cases be sending the RQS message to the originator, be it an airspace user or an ANSP. This will be considered for future updates of airspace users' systems, and will help solve the issue of supplemental flight plan data availability.
- d) The rejection/acknowledge message was mentioned. The ability for flight plan processing systems to send these messages should be taken into account in the case of procuring new systems or updating current ones. There is a task for a uniform format of REJ messages, as different States have developed slightly different content for the reject messages.

An important aspect to consider is that there are two approaches to implementing this functionality: automatic generation of reject messages upon receiving the flight plan, or sending the message from the queue after review by an operator. Under the first approach, if the error is produced by a misconfiguration of the ANSPs system or another local factor, the airspace user will be receiving REJ messages that do not have origin in their systems. Under the other approach there will be human intervention, but in case of a local error no REJ message will be generated, the system can be corrected and the flight plan accepted.
- e) ATS systems generally have more data to scrutinize flight plans with than the messaging systems. This results in flight plan errors going undetected through the flight plan processing systems on to the ATC system. In the future, AIM will centralize this data and assure its' correctness through quality control, but in the meantime a requirement for flight plan processing systems to have a database of this information or use current information should be considered.
- f) IATA indicated that several workarounds for situations have been developed in the process of interacting with ANSPs with error situations, with examples regarding SID/STAR designations.

- g) Proof of concept trials of the homogeneous procedure is a task of the Task force. Dates for these trails should be determined to move forward with the implementation of the procedure. Task force members will be invited to indicate a date when they are available for trials for the next teleconference.
- h) The ICAO CNS Regional Officer informed of several important training events: a flight plan processing workshop coordinated with the AIM Task Force and a database maintenance workshop from the system providers. More detailed information will be made available to the members for the next teleconference..

2.1.4 The regional plan was updated with information from the attending States.

2.1.5 The items that were concluded from the face to face meeting in Lima, highlighted in the appendix of working paper 18 of this ANI/WG/4 meeting, will be incorporated in the work programme of the respective work groups

2.1.6 As mentioned, the Task forces will program a teleconference to consider the items in this discussion paper