International Civil Aviation Organization

FIFTEENTH MEETING OF THE ASIA/PACIFIC AIR NAVIGATION PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION REGIONAL GROUP (APANPIRG/15)
Bangkok, Thailand, 23 to 27 August 2004

Agenda Item 2.1 : ATM/AIS/SAR Matters

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COORDINATION MEETING ON THE HONG KONG, CHINA AND JAKARTA ATS ROUTES (SCM-HKG/JKT ROUTES)

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This working paper presents the report of the Special Coordination Meeting on the Hong King, China and Jakarta ATS Routes (SCM-HKG/JKT Routes) that was held in Manila, Philippines on 11 – 13 August 2004. The meeting agreed to the arrangements to implement direct routes between Hong Kong, China and Jakarta, Indonesia.

Action by APANPIRG is proposed at paragraph 3.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 At the Eleventh South-East Asia ATS Coordination Meeting (SEACG/11) held on 24-28 May 2004, IATA requested that the meeting consider improving the South China Sea (SCS) route structure for flights operating between Hong Kong, China and Jakarta, Indonesia. Since the introduction of the revised SCS route structure on 1 November 2001, flights had experienced significant operational penalties of up to 30 minutes per round trip. In addition to extra fuel costs, increased maintenance as well as flight crew limitations had resulted in losses for one airline using the route of approximately US$ 4.6 million annually.

1.2 SEACG/11 considered IATA proposals to improve the routing, and after extensive discussions agreed to a one-way routing system using a northbound route from Jakarta via the Manila FIR to Hong Kong, China, and a southbound route on the west side of the South China Sea route structure to Jakarta.

1.3 A Special Coordination Meeting was convened hosted by the Air Transportation Office, Philippines at Manila on 11-13 August 2004.

1.4 The meeting was attended by 21 participants from Hong Kong, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam, and IATA.

2. **DISCUSSION**

2.1 The meeting reviewed the route details decided at SEACG/11, and agreed to the establishment of a new northbound route, M772 from Jakarta to Hong Kong, China via the Manila FIR. For the southbound route, the existing L642 would be used to position CONSON, then from CONSON to "DKI" VOR, a new route L644 would be established.

Operational considerations

2.2 The meeting agreed to the following operational requirements for the establishment of M772 and L644:

a) RVSM, RNP 10 and RNAV to be specified;

b) M772 northbound, FL310 and FL390 available with no-prior departure coordination (No-PDC), and all other levels subject to coordination. FL350 reassigned to L628 as No-PDC level;

c) L644 southbound, FL290 and FL370 No-PDC levels, and all other levels subject to coordination;

d) M772 restricted to one-way to Hong Kong and destinations beyond via Hong Kong;

e) L644 restricted one-way from CONSON to Jakarta;

f) the lower vertical limit of M772 at FL285;

g) M772 realigned "DKI" VOR-OSUKA-ANIPU-"VSB" VOR-TAMIB;

h) a safety assessment of the routes to be carried out by the Monitoring Agency for the Asia Region (MAAR) for RVSM, and States concerned to carry out a safety assessment including lateral aspects; and

i) States to carry out a post-implementation review and coordinate on a bi-lateral basis. An all party meeting to be convened if considered necessary.

2.3 The meeting was informed by the Philippines of operational concerns of the Manila ACC in regard to the following matters:

a) weather deviation due to the proximity of M772 to the Ho Chi Minh FIR and Sanya AOR (approximately 40 NM to the east and near parallel to the airspace boundaries);

b) increased coordination between Manila and Ho Chi Minh, Sanya and Hong Kong ACCs (already complicated by the RVSM transition procedures for the modified and single alternate flight level orientation schemes (FLOSs) and HF radio communications being used); and

c) potential change to the RVSM FLOS for the SCS routes with consequent major impact on operations and controller training.

2.4 In considering weather deviation issues, Viet Nam agreed to accept weather deviations into the Ho Chi Minh FIR from M772 without prior coordination in the event that HF radio communications between pilot and controller, and the coordination between ACCs was not completed in time, provided the aircraft did not change level. In this regard, the meeting agreed to a weather deviation contingency procedure to be included in the Philippine AIP Supplement and the Letter of Agreement (LOA) between the Ho Chi Minh and Manila ACCs. Agreement with China, who did not attend the meeting, to adopt this procedure for the Sanya AOR was also required and this would be coordinated by the Regional Office.

2.5 In regard to ATC coordination difficulties, it was agreed to restrict the traffic on the route to one-way and limit it to Jakarta to Hong Kong and destinations beyond via Hong Kong in the initial phase. Once ATC had gained experience and assessed the operational conditions, it was expected that further traffic would be accommodated.

Safety considerations

2.6 The meeting reviewed the safety requirements for implementation and operation of the route. An update of the RVSM safety assessment for the SCS routes was being carried out by MAAR as required under the ICAO RVSM/TF plan based on traffic sample data for the month of July 2004. The RVSM safety assessment would be carried out once the data was checked for accuracy and verified. The meeting noted that SEACG/11 had agreed that an update of the lateral safety assessment for the SCS routes for operation of reduced lateral separation of 60 NM/RNP 10 was required. However, a safety monitoring authority had not been established to carry out this work, and this was being considered by RASMAG. It was expected at the RASMAG/2 meeting in October 2004 that a safety monitoring authority would be identified and assigned for the airspace concerned.

2.7 The meeting recognized that L644 and M772 were crossing routes and 60 NM separation would not being applied. The RVSM safety assessment took into account the crossing situation, and the meeting agreed that States would need to carry out a safety assessment to include lateral aspects. This safety assessment did not require a collision risk model to be conducted but should include hazard identification, risk assessment and risk mitigation measures for the airspace and operating conditions.

2.8 The meeting agreed that the safety assessments should be completed by 1 November 2004 for a Go/No-Go decision on implementation to be made prior to States' publishing their AIP Supplement on 11 November 2004 to meet an implementation date of 20 January 2004 (see below)

Implementation date

2.9 In consideration of the implementation date, the meeting was advised by Singapore that a major softwaree modification to their air traffic flight data processing system was underway and no further changes could be made until after the guarantee period had expired at the end of December. In addition, the meeting recognized that the date of completion of the RVSM safety assessment was uncertain as it depended on a complete data set being available which had to be checked and verified. Also, two AIRAC cycle notification was required and the earliest date the AIP Supplement could be

issued was 11 November 2004. Accordingly, the meeting agreed to implement the routes on AIRAC date 20 January 2005 at 0000 UTC.

ASIA/PAC Basic Air Navigation Plan Amendments

2.10 The meeting reviewed and revised the draft amendment to the ASIA/PAC BANP (Doc 9673). The following States agreed to be co-originators of the proposal: Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Viet Nam.

2.11 The meeting was advised by Indonesia that they were implementing eight RNP 10 routes in the Indonesian FIRs on 25 November 2004. This would include that portion of L644 and M772 in Indonesian airspace. Malaysia agreed that M772 could be extended into the Kota Kinabalu FIR to 'VSB' VOR. Indonesia agreed to submit an amendment proposal to the BANP.

3. ACTION BY APANPIRG

3.1 The meeting is invited to note the progress to improve the SCS routes.

— — — — — — — —