International Civil Aviation Organization

Sixteenth Meeting of the FANS Interoperability Team – Asia (FIT–Asia/16)

Bangkok, Thailand, 9 – 11 June 2026

Agenda Item 4: Review of ADS/CPDLC Operations and Performance

DATA LINK PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR PHILIPPINES

(Presented by Philippines)

SUMMARY

This paper presents data link performance data for year 2025 for the Manila FIR and information on actions taken to identify and rectify the causes of performance issues

1. INTRODUCTION

Tables 1 to 4B summarize Automatic Dependent Surveillance – Contract (ADS-C) and Controller-Pilot Data Link Communications (CPDLC) performance where the Required Surveillance Performance (RSP) and Required Communications Performance (RCP) criteria stipulated in ICAO Doc 4444 – Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Air Traffic Management (PANS-ATM) were not met. Actions taken to address performance not meeting the criteria are discussed, together with the outcomes of such actions.

2. DISCUSSION

Manila FIR ADS-C RSP180 Performance – Media Type, RGS and GES

2.1 **Table 1** summarizes overall ADS-C performance per media type, Remote Ground Station (RGS) and Ground Earth Station (GES) for downlinks sent within the Manila FIR during 2025, where performance did not meet the RSP180 performance criteria.

Table 1: Manila FIR ADS-C Downlink Latency per Media Type, RGS and GES

FIR	**RPHI**					
Criteria	**RSP180**					
Period	**Jan-Jun 2025**			**Jul-Dec 2025**		
Colour Key Meets Criteria 99.0%-99.89% Under Criteria	**Message Counts**	**95%** **% < = 90sec**	**99.90%** **% <= 180sec**	**Message Counts**	**95%** **% < = 90sec**	**99.90%** **% <= 180sec**
By Media Type						
SATCOM	210849	97.93%	99.70%	199180	97.77%	99.66%
VHF	370692	98.80%	99.58%	610338	98.22%	99.11%

HF		232	45.69%	68.82%	301	46.51%	69.10%
ALL		581,773	98.64%	99.59%	809819	98.14%	99.17%
By Remote Ground Station (RGS) Ground Earth Station (GES)							
Designator	**Type**	(only RGS/GES with message counts >100 recorded)					
CAN	VHF	116	96.60%	96.96%	177	99.47%	100.00%
CXR	VHF	125	98.45%	98.75%	259	95.76%	96.51%
CXR1	VHF	556	93.27%	94.04%	246	93.39%	93.32%
H16	HF	165	47.27%	69.39%	206	49.64%	69.90%
HKG2	VHF	181	97.28%	97.49%			
IG1	SAT	22570	90.12%	98.13%	18947	91.09%	98.31%
IGW1	SAT	6129	93.57%	97.42%	5616	94.43%	98.75%
IOR5	SAT	4578	97.94%	99.14%	2524	94.37%	98.30%
ISG1	VHF	1478	96.89%	98.35%	1055	96.27%	97.99%
ISG2	VHF				354	95.24%	98.26%
MDC1	VHF	610	98.90%	99.32%	117	85.64%	85.96%
MFM	VHF	1041	96.04%	97.86%	1139	96.31%	98.38%
MMY1	VHF	2453	98.41%	99.43%	1274	96.66%	98.10%
MYYV	VHF	267	99.75%	100.00%	157	97.45%	97.46%
OKA1	VHF	816	95.83%	99.42%	296	94.76%	97.98%
SFS1	VHF	8286	98.48%	98.68%	2540	99.38%	99.57%
SYX	VHF	7774	96.78%	97.95%	7776	96.36%	97.56%
SZX	VHF	285	94.20%	96.38%	322	99.09%	100.00%
TTE1	VHF	538	97.69%	98.90%	376	95.27%	97.82%
UIH	VHF	430	98.18%	98.66%	544	93.96%	94.72%
X3P	VHF	212	100.00%	100.00%	323	98.76%	98.77%
ZUH	VHF	5271	95.30%	98.05%	3950	95.36%	97.75%

2.2 The ADS-C performance by media shows that overall performance by SATCOM and VHF met the 95% (≤90sec) criterion. HF recorded very low message counts and consistently failed all criteria throughout 2025. Under RGS/GES, 15 stations failed at least one performance criterion in January–June 2025, and 15 stations in July–December 2025. The satellite-link stations **IG1** and **IGW1** continued to exhibit the most significant shortfalls against the 95% (≤90sec) benchmark.

2.3 Geographic analysis of non-conforming VHF ground stations reveals consistent latency patterns across multiple aircraft in specific areas. Stations **ISG1**, **ISG2**, and **MMY1** recorded latency issues for aircraft operating to the NE of RPHI. Stations **CXR**, **CXR1**, **SYX**, and **UIH** recorded latency issues for aircraft to the west. Stations **MFM**, **SZX**, and **ZUH** recorded latency issues to the northwest, and **TTE1** to the south. **SFS1** recorded latency issues across multiple areas around the Philippines. These observations suggest that affected aircraft were likely operating at the outer limits of the respective ground station VHF coverage areas, and where transition to SATCOM media may introduce delays.

2.4 Manila will continue to monitor RGS/GES performance and coordinate with SITA as the Communication Service Provider (CSP) on persistent non-conformances.

2.5 SITA not able to respond on our request for performance report on stations that Manila monitored consistently below criteria, IG1 IGW1 SYX CXR CXR1. Instead, the CSP proposes a migration to another telecom as their new link provider, which currently ongoing.

Manila FIR ADS-C RSP180 Performance – Aircraft Operator/Type

2.6 **Table 2** summarizes overall ADS-C performance per Aircraft Operator/Type for downlinks sent within the Manila FIR during 2025, where performance did not meet the RSP180 performance criteria.

Table 2: Manila FIR ADS-C Downlink Latency per Aircraft Operator/Type

FIR	**RPHI**					
Criteria	**RSP180**					
Period	**Jan-Jun 2025**			**Jul-Dec 2025**		
Colour Key Meets Criteria 99.0%-99.89% Under Criteria	**Message Counts**	**95%** **% <= 90sec**	**99.90%** **% <= 180sec**	**Message Counts**	**95%** **% <= 90sec**	**99.90%** **% <= 180sec**
By Aircraft Operator / Type (only message counts >100 recorded)						
ACA/B77W	127	96.02%	98.99%			
AJX/B788	1757	99.25%	99.95%	2383	98.19%	98.81%
CAL/A21N	10176	96.87%	98.74%	11443	96.95%	99.19%
CES/A333	3421	94.94%	96.45%	4033	96.95%	98.02%
CPA/B77W	13839	92.17%	98.09%	17353	93.33%	98.44%
CSN/A20N	5276	97.50%	99.72%	6886	97.56%	98.78%
CSN/A21N	11516	93.42%	97.19%	13981	95.24%	98.02%
FDX/B77L	5525	96.92%	98.79%	5786	96.65%	98.67%
GIA/A332	710	99.73%	99.76%	286	96.33%	96.90%
MAS/A333	1786	98.39%	98.78%	8001	98.61%	98.89%
PAL/A21N	15926	97.97%	98.94%	23172	98.00%	99.06%
PAL/A321	24594	94.64%	95.89%	47226	93.32%	94.86%
RCH/K35R	372	99.92%	100.00%	147	96.07%	98.84%
SJX/A21N	11114	97.06%	99.28%	8174	96.72%	98.89%
SJX/A339				137	85.55%	94.73%
TGW/A20N	1118	97.50%	98.92%	2307	98.79%	99.87%
TGW/A21N	2857	95.27%	97.11%	3303	98.94%	99.46%
THA/A359	1151	96.20%	96.92%	1203	94.61%	95.14%
THA/B77W	307	96.94%	98.73%	842	97.15%	99.32%
XAX/A333	6373	98.95%	99.43%	8032	97.80%	98.53%
ACA/B77W	127	96.02%	98.99%			
AJX/B788	1757	99.25%	99.95%	2383	98.19%	98.81%

2.7 The ADS-C performance by aircraft operator/type for January–June 2025 shows 14 aircraft operators/types that did not meet the RSP 180 criteria. For July–December 2025, 15 aircraft operators/types failed to meet the criteria.

2.8 A closer review of selected non-conforming operators reveals the following findings at the airframe level. For **ACA/B77W**, two individual airframes, **CFIVM** and **CFIVX**, marginally failed to meet the 180-second delivery criterion on isolated instances.

For **AJX/B788**, one airframe, JA803A, showed recurring latency issues and was observed to be exclusively transiting via SATCOM ground stations APK2 and IOR5, suggesting the delays are linked to satellite media performance on those specific paths.

For **PAL/A21N**, two airframes — RPC9933 and RPC9934 — were consistently and marginally meeting the 95% criterion throughout the year, indicating borderline but persistent underperformance.

For **SJX/A21N**, all airframes in the B58201–B58213 series also showed consistently marginal performance throughout the year, and were observed to be frequently transiting via IG1 (SAT), which may be a contributing factor to their latency values.

PAL/A321 and **CPA/B77W** continue to be persistently non-compliant across both reporting periods. A closer review of PAL/A321 performance data identified that the non-conforming airframes belong to the RPC99XX registration series. Upon examination of flight plan entries, it was found that these airframes are not fully PBCS-compliant in their filed flight plans

2.9 Manila will continue to monitor ADS-C performance, where persistent or significant failures are identified, coordinate with the relevant aircraft operators thru CAAP regulatory body as the oversight and regulatory authority to notify of their noncompliance fleet.

Manila FIR CPDLC RCP240 Performance – Media Type, RGS and GES

2.10 **Tables 3A and 3B** summarize overall CPDLC performance per Media Type, RGS and GES for messages sent within the Manila FIR during 2025, where performance did not meet the RCP240 performance criteria.

Table 3A: Manila FIR CPDLC Performance Latency per per Media Type, RGS and GES – Jan-Jun 2025.

FIR	**RPHI**					
Criteria	**RCP240**					
Period	**Jan-Jun 2025**					
Colour Key Meets Criteria 99.0%-99.89% Under Criteria	**Message Counts**	95% Benchmark		99.9% Benchmark		95%
		ACP	**ACTP**	**ACP**	**ACTP**	**PORT**
		% < = 180sec	**% <= 120sec**	**% < = 210sec**	**% <= 150sec**	**%< 60secs**
By Media Type						
SATCOM	13966	98.94%	99.90%	99.09%	99.91%	93.21%
VHF	15556	98.29%	98.72%	98.52%	98.84%	95.53%
VS	259	96.60%	99.31%	97.30%	99.38%	79.54%
SV	3117	99.78%	99.90%	99.80%	99.92%	98.28%
HV	456	80.81%	75.88%	84.76%	82.89%	74.56%
ALL	33354	98.27%	98.70%	98.52%	98.89%	95.01%

By Remote Ground Station (RGS) Ground Earth Station (GES)							
Designator	**Type**	(RGS/GES with message counts >100)					
APK1	SAT	5602	97.49%	97.73%	97.73%	97.89%	94.06%
APK2	SAT	1289	98.50%	98.39%	98.76%	98.53%	96.35%
BKI	VHF	233	98.41%	99.10%	98.47%	99.21%	97.63%
H16	HV	277	83.48%	79.06%	86.96%	84.48%	76.53%
IG1	SAT	1571	97.14%	99.91%	98.10%	99.94%	85.11%
IGW1	SAT	293	94.05%	98.68%	95.10%	99.19%	81.91%
IOR5	SAT	320	97.41%	99.06%	97.90%	99.18%	91.88%
KHH	VHF	217	93.45%	92.48%	93.69%	93.32%	93.09%
LAO	VHF	2696	97.41%	97.71%	97.72%	97.91%	95.29%
MNL	VHF	995	98.63%	98.81%	98.73%	98.91%	96.98%
SFS1	VHF	347	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.91%
SYX	VHF	171	82.78%	84.94%	84.02%	87.80%	78.36%
TTE1	VHF	130	98.53%	100.00%	98.60%	100.00%	97.83%
XXA	SAT	2402	99.46%	100.00%	99.50%	100.00%	92.96%
XXI	SAT	1269	98.45%	99.86%	98.59%	99.88%	93.22%
XXP	SAT	994	99.18%	100.00%	99.51%	100.00%	94.06%

Table 3B: Manila FIR CPDLC Performance Latency per per Media Type, RGS and GES – Jul-Dec 2025.

FIR	**RPHI**					
Criteria	**RCP240**					
Period	**Jul-Dec 2025**					
Colour Key Meets Criteria 99.0%-99.89% Under Criteria	**Message Counts**	95% Benchmark		99.9% Benchmark		95%
		ACP	**ACTP**	**ACP**	**ACTP**	**PORT**
		% <= 180sec	**% <= 120sec**	**% < = 210sec**	**% <= 150sec**	**%< 60secs**
By Media Type						
SATCOM	28612	97.52%	99.94%	97.72%	99.96%	91.22%
VHF	31426	97.17%	98.59%	97.48%	98.74%	94.10%
VS	450	92.10%	99.84%	92.93%	99.88%	73.78%
SV	5959	99.74%	99.99%	99.76%	100.00%	98.24%
HV	780	79.49%	71.41%	83.01%	80.00%	73.85%
ALL	67227	97.21%	98.61%	97.52%	98.83%	93.64%
By Remote Ground Station (RGS) Ground Earth Station (GES)						
Designator	**Type**	(RGS/GES with message counts >100)				
APK1	SAT	11774	95.06%	97.73%	95.38%	97.91%	91.28%
APK2	SAT	2654	98.68%	99.00%	98.78%	99.15%	95.93%
APK7	SAT	204	84.99%	100.00%	85.59%	100.00%	81.43%
BKI	VHF	366	98.51%	97.17%	98.59%	97.24%	98.18%

DVO	VHF	1150	98.79%	99.23%	98.96%	99.32%	97.22%
H06	HV	103	71.29%	58.25%	73.07%	66.99%	68.67%
H10	HV	134	78.49%	71.43%	80.22%	78.11%	72.01%
H16	HV	471	80.47%	73.25%	84.55%	82.17%	75.27%
IG1	SAT	3110	93.60%	99.12%	95.37%	99.43%	80.96%
IGW1	SAT	671	92.47%	99.83%	93.93%	100.00%	85.25%
IOR5	SAT	727	96.00%	99.64%	96.30%	100.00%	89.55%
IOR7	SAT	231	91.13%	100.00%	91.47%	100.00%	88.74%
IOR8	SAT	364	92.91%	100.00%	93.01%	100.00%	88.64%
ISG1	VHF	144	99.31%	100.00%	99.35%	100.00%	92.36%
KHH	VHF	542	96.07%	96.54%	96.23%	96.97%	95.30%
LAO	VHF	6452	97.35%	97.53%	97.63%	97.75%	95.30%
MNL	VHF	1866	98.69%	99.04%	98.74%	99.15%	96.89%
PPS	VHF	1735	98.13%	99.11%	98.42%	99.27%	95.39%
SYX	VHF	413	82.81%	85.71%	83.56%	87.18%	77.24%
XXA	SAT	2201	98.56%	99.93%	98.82%	99.95%	92.23%
XXI	SAT	2440	96.80%	99.96%	96.98%	99.97%	91.02%
XXP	SAT	1758	98.44%	99.96%	98.66%	99.98%	92.09%
XXQ	SAT	2478	98.48%	100.00%	98.56%	100.00%	91.04%
ZUH	VHF	132	97.52%	100.00%	98.36%	100.00%	86.17%

2.11 For **Table 3A** covering Jan-June 2025 **SYX** and **KHH** consistently failed in all criteria in addition to the ever-existing HF station. ACP in the 99.9% benchmark displays the most failure among the performance monitoring. For **table 3B**, still **SYX** totally failed in all performance in addition to other HF stations and ACP just like the first semester almost totally failed in the 99.9% benchmark.

2.12 Somewhere in between the station of SYX and KHH a wide body of sea water along the west and north side of Manila and in between those 2 stations transitioning from VDL to SAT happens.

2.13 Manila will continue to conduct performance monitoring and furnished CSP requesting under performance station specifically for whole year monitoring.

2.14 Manila is accepting the reality that it is surrounded by a wide body of sea water and due to its geographical complexity performance issue on its PBCS monitoring significantly behind and unfavorable compared to other FIR.

Manila FIR CPDLC RCP240 Performance – Aircraft Operator/Type

2.15 **Tables 4A and 4B** summarizes overall CPDLC performance per Aircraft Operator/Type for messages sent within the Manila FIR during 2025, where performance did not meet the RCP240 performance criteria.

Table 4A: Manila FIR CPDLC Performance Latency per Aircraft Operator/Type – Jan-Jun 2025

FIR	RPHI					
Criteria	RCP240					
Period	Jan-Jun 2025					
Colour Key Meets Criteria 99.0%-99.89% Under Criteria	Message Counts	95% Benchmark		99.9% Benchmark		95%
		ACP	ACTP	ACP	ACTP	PORT
		% < = 180sec	% <= 120sec	% < = 210sec	% <= 150sec	%<60secs
By Aircraft Operator / Type (only message counts >100 recorded)						
AAR/A21N	283	99.68%	100.00%	99.85%	100.00%	90.00%
ABL/A21N	147	97.73%	100.00%	98.04%	100.00%	91.84%
ANA/B788	490	96.97%	96.74%	97.39%	96.94%	93.67%
CAL/A21N	409	95.98%	99.06%	96.80%	99.42%	91.28%
CAL/A359	869	93.38%	92.94%	94.28%	93.65%	92.29%
CCA/A333	170	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.90%
CES/A333	123	99.38%	100.00%	99.69%	100.00%	94.31%
CPA/A333	330	98.62%	99.75%	99.14%	99.80%	90.15%
CPA/A35K	223	99.66%	100.00%	99.72%	100.00%	94.66%
CPA/B773	170	98.96%	100.00%	99.39%	100.00%	82.16%
CPA/B77W	846	98.44%	100.00%	99.07%	100.00%	90.07%
CSC/A332	126	97.76%	98.75%	98.15%	98.95%	93.75%
CSN/A21N	651	99.50%	100.00%	99.60%	100.00%	94.16%
CSN/A333	657	96.91%	96.18%	97.42%	96.50%	94.82%
CSN/B789	1868	97.69%	96.96%	98.07%	97.23%	96.09%
CXA/B789	497	98.13%	97.54%	98.41%	97.68%	96.38%
FDX/B77L	144	96.44%	98.12%	97.30%	98.27%	88.43%
HVN/A359	186	97.93%	100.00%	97.98%	100.00%	96.67%
KAL/A21N	213	99.53%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.19%
KAL/A333	332	99.17%	100.00%	99.25%	100.00%	94.13%
KAL/B77W	486	99.86%	100.00%	99.91%	100.00%	91.98%
MAS/A333	369	98.23%	100.00%	98.60%	100.00%	94.58%
PAL/A21N	407	98.82%	99.31%	98.90%	99.39%	94.10%
PAL/A321	316	99.08%	99.69%	99.32%	99.69%	94.30%
PAL/A333	365	94.86%	99.17%	94.97%	99.30%	93.08%
QFA/A332	458	99.78%	100.00%	99.80%	100.00%	94.54%
QFA/A333	601	99.35%	100.00%	99.41%	100.00%	94.18%
QTR/B77W	103	97.90%	100.00%	99.30%	100.00%	92.88%
SIA/A359	1867	92.58%	92.18%	93.22%	93.84%	90.52%
SIA/B77W	372	99.34%	100.00%	99.48%	100.00%	94.62%
SIA/B78X	1131	95.46%	95.40%	95.78%	95.86%	93.46%

SJX/A21N	284	98.60%	99.93%	98.82%	100.00%	91.90%
TWBA333	107	99.96%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	89.72%
UAE/B77W	224	99.57%	100.00%	99.72%	100.00%	91.63%
UAL/B77W	126	99.25%	100.00%	99.68%	100.00%	92.74%
XAX/A333	410	97.24%	99.90%	97.35%	100.00%	89.02%

Table 4B: Manila FIR CPDLC Performance Latency per Aircraft Operator/Type –July-Dec 2025

FIR	**RPHI**					
Criteria	**RCP240**					
Period	**Jul-Dec 2025**					
Colour Key Meets Criteria 99.0%-99.89% Under Criteria	**Message Counts**	95% Benchmark		99.9% Benchmark		95%
		ACP	**ACTP**	**ACP**	**ACTP**	**PORT**
		% < = 180sec	**% <= 120sec**	**% < = 210sec**	**% <= 150sec**	**%< 60secs**
By Aircraft Operator / Type (only message counts >100 recorded)						
AAR/A21N	524	96.61%	100.00%	96.78%	100.00%	87.98%
AAR/A333	107	91.74%	93.90%	92.50%	94.59%	91.65%
AAR/A359	365	98.42%	100.00%	98.48%	100.00%	94.52%
AAR/B772	198	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	92.42%
ABL/A21N	433	99.21%	100.00%	99.80%	100.00%	93.15%
ACA/B789	317	99.87%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.69%
AJX/B788	270	98.10%	98.46%	98.22%	98.71%	96.61%
ANA/B788	1252	97.65%	97.34%	97.74%	97.93%	95.77%
ANA/B789	1861	97.72%	97.96%	98.05%	98.42%	96.13%
ANA/B78X	325	96.80%	96.38%	96.87%	96.65%	96.00%
CAL/A21N	643	96.66%	99.99%	97.84%	100.00%	92.53%
CAL/A359	1718	92.78%	92.26%	93.20%	93.28%	89.70%
CCA/A333	398	99.75%	100.00%	99.79%	100.00%	93.22%
CEB/A339	1364	95.83%	100.00%	95.92%	100.00%	93.18%
CES/A332	1010	98.85%	99.33%	98.93%	99.43%	96.53%
CES/A333	233	98.87%	100.00%	99.19%	100.00%	93.13%
CES/A359	578	97.55%	96.85%	97.70%	97.24%	96.97%
CHH/B789	1189	99.79%	99.97%	98.84%	100.00%	98.40%
CPA/A333	522	97.11%	99.81%	98.53%	99.83%	87.74%
CPA/B773	317	97.27%	99.56%	97.66%	100.00%	83.91%
CPA/B77W	1308	98.30%	100.00%	98.80%	100.00%	87.61%
CSN/A21N	1208	99.60%	100.00%	99.68%	100.00%	93.43%
CSN/A333	582	95.38%	94.97%	95.75%	95.77%	93.37%
CSN/B77L	229	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.43%

CSN/B789	2295	95.31%	94.38%	95.86%	95.03%	93.06%
CXA/B789	826	99.05%	98.73%	99.08%	98.92%	97.46%
ETD/A332	146	75.02%	100.00%	75.27%	100.00%	69.41%
EVA/A333	672	97.47%	100.00%	97.61%	100.00%	94.49%
FDX/B77L	244	96.75%	97.71%	96.97%	98.10%	88.11%
HVN/A359	485	93.88%	97.73%	93.96%	98.10%	91.07%
KAL/A21N	515	97.54%	100.00%	98.75%	100.00%	90.68%
KAL/A333	924	92.44%	99.94%	92.65%	99.98%	87.55%
KAL/B773	187	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.12%
KAL/B77W	1296	99.42%	99.96%	99.77%	99.98%	92.98%
KAL/B78X	129	98.57%	100.00%	98.77%	100.00%	97.74%
LKE/A20N	157	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	91.24%
MAS/A333	1057	92.68%	99.93%	93.00%	99.95%	90.63%
MAS/A339	131	78.58%	100.00%	79.09%	100.00%	76.92%
PAL/A21N	832	98.33%	99.79%	98.57%	99.90%	92.07%
PAL/A321	855	98.43%	100.00%	98.90%	100.00%	96.37%
PAL/A333	665	93.55%	99.90%	93.61%	99.94%	89.96%
PAL/A359	113	98.42%	100.00%	98.94%	100.00%	92.92%
QFA/A332	683	99.48%	99.86%	99.74%	99.86%	94.44%
QFA/A333	986	99.61%	100.00%	99.74%	100.00%	94.22%
QTR/B77W	228	97.87%	99.82%	98.42%	100.00%	87.28%
SIA/A359	3417	90.87%	92.38%	91.74%	93.74%	89.03%
SIA/B77W	777	98.76%	99.92%	99.26%	100.00%	92.66%
SIA/B78X	2877	96.29%	95.93%	96.67%	96.76%	93.95%
SJX/A21N	457	95.84%	99.85%	97.30%	100.00%	89.72%
SJX/A359	125	98.71%	99.54%	98.83%	99.66%	94.40%
TGW/A20N	163	88.92%	99.57%	89.48%	100.00%	84.66%
TWBA333	279	95.81%	100.00%	95.88%	100.00%	90.49%
UAE/B77W	523	98.71%	100.00%	99.13%	100.00%	89.55%
UAL/B77W	326	98.57%	100.00%	99.40%	100.00%	89.78%

2.16 For **Table 4A** Jan-Jun 2025, the CPDLC under ACP has 8% under criteria and 5% under criteria for ACTP under the 95% benchmark while under ACP on the 99.9% benchmark it has 47% under criteria and 25% on ACTP. On the PORT column only 8% above the criteria. For Table 4B, the CPDLC under ACP has 22% under criteria and 9% under criteria for ACTP in the 95% benchmark. While under ACP on 99.9% benchmark it has 72% under criteria and 25% on ACTP and on the PORT column only 18% is above criteria.

2.17 Aside from SITAs planned and unplanned outages, Manila still encountered a lot of issues on its ADS/CPDLC communication in its system side which dominantly experience by the operator and sometimes issues relayed from the pilot.

2.18 The frequent issues encountered were the unresponsiveness of ADS/CPDLC window and has been resolved for immediate respond to relaunch the application.

2.19 Although the immediate action mentioned extinguish the problem but recurrency of same issues would appear over time, this issue has been raised to the vendor and recommending to upgrade its hardware which currently happened this year and hopefully completed by year 2027.

Additional Information

2.20 From the above performance, Manila have taken an operator/aircraft type for a performance check and possible causes for its low performance. With the help of Airways New Zealand as a way to demonstrate the capability of their product, under ADS-C RSP-180, PAL A321 displays poor performance over oceanic area, by pulling their FPL, it was not SATCOM equipped thereby justifying their low performance in limited VDL coverage or in area where transitioning from VDL to SATCOM occurs.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

a) note the information contained in this paper; and

b) discuss or recommend any relevant matters as appropriate.

— END —