



WORKING PAPER

**IFPP Integration Working Group
Phoenix, AZ, USA**

January 28 – February 3, 2012

AERODROME LOCATION INDICATOR SCHEME EXTENSION

(Presented by Stephane Dubet)

SUMMARY

This paper identifies the limitations to the existing ICAO location indicator scheme.

It discusses the conventions that have been developed to overcome the identified issues and addresses the related impacts on the aeronautical databases.

It includes a proposition for an extension of the ICAO location indicator scheme.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Aerodromes used for commercial air transport are assigned an ICAO location indicator, according to a scheme defined in ICAO Doc 7910 (Location Indicators). These codes are made by a combination of four letters that has a regional structure. The first letter is allocated by continent and represents a country or group of countries within that continent. The second letter generally represents a country within that region, and the remaining two are used to identify each airport. The exception to this rule is larger countries that have single-letter country codes, where the remaining three letters identify the aerodrome. There is no duplication allowed in the aerodrome location indicator scheme.
- 1.2 The ICAO codes are used for air traffic control and airline systems and operations. Examples include flight planning or aerodrome referencing in NOTAMs.
- 1.3 There are limitations to the existing location indicator scheme: a combination of two letters among the 26 available letters lead to a maximum of 676 indicators for those States where the two first letters are “fixed”. Thus the ICAO aerodrome location indicator scheme cannot be applied to all aerodromes (e.g. helistations, private airports, some domestic aerodromes).

(3 pages)

IFPP IWG Jan 2012 - WP - location indicator scheme extension

2. DISCUSSION

- 2.1 With the development of PBN, the number of aerodromes equipped with RNP procedures raises and will continue to steadily do so over the next few years. Given the limitation in the existing scheme, it is deemed important to have an extension of the existing scheme in order to be able to assign location indicators that can be used in various systems.
- 2.2 For example, for NOTAMs, ICAO Doc 8126 states “If there is no available ICAO location indicator, use the ICAO nationality letter as given in Doc 7910, Part 2, plus XX and followed up in Item E) by the name, in plain language”. The problem is that with such a scheme, it is not possible to filter the NOTAM in flight briefing systems.
- 2.3 Some States have already established conventions for aerodrome location identifiers where the ICAO scheme cannot be applied. They are used regularly in those States for all the same purposes as the International Airport Location Identifiers (except ICAO flight plans). These conventions have look alike but do not stick to a unique scheme, as shown in the examples below

- CDW2 CY Canada
- CEL8 CY Canada
- PPC MM Mexico
- C23 PT Micronesia
- N55 PK Marshall Islands
- APO SA Argentina
- Z08 NS American Samoa
- 04G K5 United States
- 22Y K3 United States
- 2TA8 K4 United States

- 2.4 A database manufacturer indicated that nearly 7000 aerodromes in their standard ARINC 424 database with aerodrome identifiers not complying with the ICAO existing scheme. It also mentioned that there is a limitation to 4 characters in the database systems but that the use of alphanumeric characters is not a problem.

3. PROPOSITIONS

- 3.1 It is proposed to extend the ICAO location indicator scheme while maintaining a certain level of continuity with the existing scheme and aiming at global consistency.
- 3.2 Given afore mentioned considerations, such a scheme shall be based on four alphanumeric characters and maintain at least the existing rule for the first letter (continental / regional) of the code. It should maintain as well, where possible, the second letter of the code for the given State. For example, for France (LF), codes could be LFA2, LF2B, LF23, etc. For the USA (K), codes could be K123, KB08, etc.

4. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The IWG is invited to:

- (1) Discuss the propositions included in this WP
- (2) Agree on the need to propose a globally consistent extension of the ICAO location indicator scheme
- (3) Determine, in coordination with the ICAO AIM section, the actual ICAO material that would include the proposed extension to the location indicator scheme

— — — —