



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization  
Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Regional Airspace Safety  
Monitoring Advisory Group (RASMAG/26)  
Video Teleconference, 20 – 23 September 2021

## Agenda Item 5: Airspace Safety Monitoring Activities/Requirements in the Asia/Pacific Region

### IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE REMOVAL OF THE 1,000-FLIGHT HOUR PORTION OF THE RVSM HEIGHT MONITORING REQUIREMENT FROM ICAO ANNEX 6

(Presented by the Monitoring Agency for Asia Region)

#### SUMMARY

RMACG/16 meeting agreed in principle with the standing proposal in RMACG to remove the 1,000-flight hour requirement from ICAO Annex 6 – *Operation of Aircraft*. The removal of such requirement would tighten but simplify the long-term height monitoring requirement to once every two years. This led the meeting to agree on *Action RMACG/16:6 All RMAs to provide data on operators who are taking advantage of the 1000 hours monitoring requirement*. To address this action, MAAR plan to assess the impact of the removal of the 1,000-flight hour portion of the height monitoring requirement from ICAO Annex 6 using a questionnaire.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 In the previous Regional Monitoring Agencies Coordination Group (RMACG) meetings, the North American Approvals and Monitoring Organization (NAARMO) made a proposal to remove the 1,000-hour portion of the recurrent Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum (RVSM) height monitoring requirement specified in ICAO Annex 6 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation, which reads:

*“The State of Registry/Operator that has issued an RVSM approval to an owner/operator shall establish a requirement which ensures that a minimum of two aeroplanes of each aircraft type grouping of the owner/operator have their height-keeping performance monitored, **at least once every two years or within intervals of 1 000 flight hours per aeroplane, whichever period is longer**. If an owner/operator aircraft type grouping consists of a single aeroplane, monitoring of that aeroplane shall be accomplished within the specified period.”*

1.2 The main reasons for the proposal include the impracticality of tracking the flight hours of each aircraft as well as the increased availability of height monitoring options. The removal of such portion of the requirement would tighten but simplify the long-term height monitoring requirement to once every two years.

1.3 During RMACG/16, NAARMO presented a paper which recalled the history of RVSM development and the need for height monitoring requirements, as well as evidence of ASE instability, the basis for the 1000 hour and the two-year requirements, and other possible statements of monitoring requirements.

1.4 The meeting further discussed the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on some operators, at times aircraft could remain on the ground for year at a time, resulting in an unquantified effect on the ASE. The meeting noted that RMAs do not track the 1000 hours, as this could only be practically left up to the operator.

1.5 Noting that timeframe of this change to be in effect would take many years from now and the proposal would yet to be reviewed by several bodies, the meeting agreed in principle with the proposal to remove the 1,000-flight hour portion of the requirement from Annex 6. After some discussions, the meeting agreed on the following action:

***ACTION RMACG/16:6: All RMAs to provide data on operators who are taking advantage of the 1000 hours monitoring requirement.***

## **2. DISCUSSION**

2.1 Since there are many States under MAAR's responsibilities, to fulfill this task, MAAR plans to administered a questionnaire to collect information from States regarding any aircraft operators who are currently fulfilling the long-term height monitoring requirement based on the 1,000 flight-hour basis. The questionnaire will compose the following questions:

- Please enter your State:
- Are you currently allowing your operators to fulfill the long-term height monitoring requirements specified in Annex 6 based on the 1,000-flight hour portion of the requirement?
- If the answer is yes, please, provide the following information/answer:
  - o The name of the operators that are being applied the 1,000-flight hour portion of the requirement
  - o The method used to track their flight hours
  - o If the 1,000-flight hour portion of the requirement were removed from Annex 6 in the future, how would the change affect the overall RVSM safety oversight of these operators?
- Do you agree with the proposal to remove the 1,000-flight hour portion of the requirement?
- Please provide any additional comments:

2.2 The questionnaire will be administered both via an online form and in an electronic form as an attached file to MAAR's email (see **attachment**).

2.3 If there are no major changes to the questionnaire, the link to the questionnaire (Google Forms) will be sent out to POCs of all States by **September 2021**. All MAAR States are requested to complete the questionnaire and send it back to MAAR by **October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2021**.

## **3. ACTION BY THE MEETING**

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this paper;
- b) endorse the proposal for administering questionnaire and the questions; and
- c) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

— END —

Attachment

## Application of 1,000-Flight Hour Portion of the Height Monitoring Requirements in ICAO Annex 6

Regional Monitoring Agencies are making a proposal to remove the 1,000-flight hour portion of the recurrent Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum (RVSM) height monitoring requirement specified in ICAO Annex 6 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation, which reads:

*“The State of Registry/Operator that has issued an RVSM approval to an owner/operator shall establish a requirement which ensures that a minimum of two aeroplanes of each aircraft type grouping of the owner/operator have their height-keeping performance monitored, **at least once every two years or within intervals of 1 000 flight hours per aeroplane, whichever period is longer.** If an owner/operator aircraft type grouping consists of a single aeroplane, monitoring of that aeroplane shall be accomplished within the specified period.”*

The removal of such portion of the requirement would tighten but simplify the long-term height monitoring requirement to once every two years. Please also note that the time frame of this change to be in effect would take many years from now, and the proposal would yet to be reviewed by several bodies.

**In order to assess the impact of this change on operators in your State, please help us answer the questions below:**

---

\* Required

**1. Please enter your State: \***

**Mark only one oval.**

- Afghanistan
- Bangladesh
- Bhutan
  
- Brunei
- Cambodia
- China (Hong Kong)
- China (Macau)
- China (Taiwan)
- India
  
- Lao PDR
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mongolia
- Myanmar
- Nepal
- Pakistan
- Philippines
- Singapore
  
- Sri Lanka
- Thailand
- Vietnam

2. **Are you currently allowing your operators to fulfill the long-term height monitoring requirements specified in Annex 6 based on the 1,000-flight hour portion of the requirement? \***

Mark only one oval.

Yes

No

**If the answer to the question above is 'yes', please, provide the following information/answer** (if the answer is 'no,' please skip to question 6):

3. **The name of the operators that are being applied the 1,000-flight hour portion of the requirement**

---

---

---

4. **The method used to track their flight hours**

---

---

---

5. **If the 1,000-flight hour portion of the requirement were removed from Annex 6 in the future, how would the change affect the overall RVSM safety oversight of these operators?**

---

---

---

6. **Do you agree with the proposal to remove the 1,000-flight hour portion of the requirement? \***

Mark only one oval.

Yes

No

7. **Please provide any additional comments:**

---

---

---

---

---

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms