



FPL Monitoring Group Minute of Teleconference/17 (6 July 2016 at 1800 UTC)

References:

1

Purpose and agenda:

Statement of purpose:

- 1 Review of data collected from phase 4.

Participants:

1. Curaçao: Natasha Leonora-Belefanti
2. Dominican Republic: Fernando Casso (rapporteur)
3. IATA: Marco Vidal
4. México: Daniel Castañeda, José de Jesús Jiménez, Ricardo Sánchez, Rafael Castro, Margarita Rangel
5. PIARCO: Ricky Bissessar
6. USA: Dan Eaves

Discussions:

Review of data collected from phase 4

1. The preliminary analysis data was reviewed. There were about 7,000 more duplicates than from last data collection. Both ATS units and operators have originated more duplicates than the last phase. There are very few cases reported in which both ATS units and operators have generated duplicates in conjunction.
2. The main originating addresses were reviewed, in which several addresses were outstanding: MMMXPLNS (the PLANSA system in Mexico), KDENX LDS (the Jeppesen page for flight plan filing), and MPTOZPZX (Tocumen Airport in Panama).
3. United States asked if the total number flight plan processed is known, as a greater data set would imply a greater number of duplicates detected. The rapporteur agreed, and added that a true comparison between the third and fourth data collection would be possible if the total number of flight plans is used. The rapporteur asked if this number is obtainable. Due to the time elapsed since the data collection, some States expressed impossibility of obtaining this figure. Not having this number of total flight plans for each FIR will not allow establishing the needed baseline, but in any case the rapporteur asked those states that can give this number to do so, only for the exercise, and to have a general idea of the percentage (ACT 01/17). United States asked if all FIRs reported this time, and in this last data collection there were more States reporting, which is also a factor.
4. IATA asked if the data shown was of arrivals, departures, overflights or a combination of these, to which the rapporteur responded that the data included all of them.
5. Mexico commented on the MMMXPLNS address, which reported the most duplicates. They explained that this address is from an internal flight plan processing system, which is in testing phase. This system evaluates if there is a slot for the flight in their ATFM system, and if so, accepts the flight plan in the ATC system. Thus, the operator that is really originating the flight plan does not appear, so this should be taken into account.
6. Mexico also commented that they are working on a system that will generate error messages upon receiving erroneous flight plans, much like COCESNA's system. The rapporteur mentioned that, as more FIR implement this kind of system, it be possible that those FIRs that receive the errors be able to act upon the rejection message. This is specially true for the operators, because in many cases the originating address belongs to an automated system which is not normally designed to receive messages. United States considered that it would be helpful to have a technical discussion of this matter, to share experiences and lessons learned between States like themselves, Mexico,



**FPL Monitoring Group
Minute of Teleconference/17
(6 July 2016 at 1800 UTC)**

COCESNA and PIARCO, that have been working with these types of systems. The rapporteur added that a contributing factor to the success of these systems is the implementation of AMHS, as this will bring the possibility of defining a reply address that may be different from the originating address, and thus allow error messages to be directed to a terminal dedicated to their treatment.

7. The rapporteur mentioned that he had earlier had a teleconference with IATA regarding the detected duplicates, and that a list was provided with the dates and callsigns of the reported flight plans. IATA had requested the flight plans in question, so as to have more information and be able to help. This was offered as a suggestion for the rest of the FIRs. Some FIRs do not have that information available any more, so it was agreed to take this into account for the next data collection (ACT 02/17).
8. United States commented that the majority of the cases should be those in which both the ATS unit and the airline submit the same flight plan, but the data collection results shows otherwise. Nonetheless, IATA also considered that this should be the case. Trinidad and Tobago asked whether the airlines or the ATS units should file the flight plan, and IATA insisted that ICAO present a regional position to this respect. The rapporteur recalled that previously the group discussed presenting a position to ICAO regarding how flight plans should be filed, and talked about what is currently established in ICAO documentation, where first the flight plan is submitted and later originated. This is similar on how Canada explained their process of receiving the flight plan from the airline only at the departure aerodrome, understanding that the downstream FIRs will receive the information via AIDC. United States commented that in their case the airlines file to the ARTCCs and the system validates the flight plan, which is accepted or rejected, and pointed out that each FIR should have the responsibility that there be only one version of each flight plan. Their opinion is that there should be a procedure set up where the filer send the flight plan to the local ANSP, and that flight plan should be the only and correct flight plan.
9. The rapporteur commented that in the Dominican Republic flight plans should be filed to the local ATS Unit, and then this flight plan is distributed. Many times the flight plan has already been distributed by the airline, so this is a source of duplication. The rapporteur also commented that previously there was a conversation between themselves, IATA and Delta in terms of exploring a way the airline can submit the flight plan electronically to the departure ATS unit only, in the case of flight departing the Dominican Republic. In that time, Delta expressed it would be very complicated to modify their software to this purpose. Curaçao questioned why it would be complicated, and was of the opinion that it could have been done. IATA explained briefly how these systems work, and why it is difficult to modify the system. The United States agreed, and offered as an example their case in which airlines only file to the departure ARTCC, as there is automation internally in the country, as a request to the filers. It is hard but it can be done. IATA agreed that it is possible, and insisted that there should be a harmonization of procedures in this respect. United States added that there could be a number of solutions to this problem, being necessary to look at it from both a technical and procedural point of view.
10. The rapporteur suggested that the group have a teleconference to discuss a proposal to ICAO for a regional procedure for flight plan filing. This teleconference is to be held on August 3rd (ACT 03/17). In the meantime, IATA and the rapporteur will send a list of the relevant information from the documentation referring to flight plan processing, so the group can consider this before the teleconference (ACT 04/17). This information is to be sent to the group by Tuesday July 12. Any other contributions can be sent to the rapporteur for distribution to the members.

Review of Previous Action Items

ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments
01/16	COCESNA to send IATA a draft of the AIC relative to the operation of the FPL validation system	Valid	
02/16	Rappoteur to ask Canada's representative for details	Complete	



**FPL Monitoring Group
Minute of Teleconference/17
(6 July 2016 at 1800 UTC)**

ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments
	on their flight plan processing procedure.		

Summary of Action Items from this Meeting

ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments
01/17	Members to submit to the rapporteur the total number of flight plans processed during the last data collection, if available	Valid	
02/17	FIRs to record samples of duplicate flight plans during the next data collection in September	Valid	
03/17	Members to participate in teleconference to draft a recommendation to ICAO for a regional procedure for flight plan filing.	Valid	Scheduled for August 3 rd 2016
04/17	Rapporteur, with assistance from IATA, to send to members references to ICAO documentation pertaining to flight plan processing, to serve as input for the teleconference referred to in Act 03/17	Valid	Due July 12 2016

Next meeting: August 3rd at 1800 UTC.