

ADDENDUM TO DRAFT REPORT UNDER AGENDA ITEM 6

APPENDIX XX

Report on Small Working Group (SWG/2) To discuss possible changes from ATS routes to RNAV routes

At the request of SEA-RR/TF/3, Mr. John Wagstaff, IFATCA Representative, agreed to act as the moderator for the SWG/2.

1. The Small Working Group/2 (SWG/2) consisted of representatives from 10 States and two international organisations.
2. The SWG reviewed WP/5, Changing ATS Routes to RNAV, and noted that whilst the majority of newly established routes have been classified as RNAV routes, the requirements for RNAV classification should now also be applied to many of the long established ATS routes. IATA advised the SWG of the benefits that RNAV routes can bring to operators. The SWG was also advised that there was almost total equipage of airline fleets to enable immediate use of RNP 10 and RNP 4 procedures.
3. It was emphasised that any changes from ATS to RNAV would need to be coordinated on a regional basis as some of the ATS routes passed beyond the area under consideration by the meeting.
4. The meeting then considered which ATS routes in their airspace could be classified as RNAV routes. Each State provided details of ATS routes that were either being actively reclassified or considered as RNAV routes. It was noted that some States had already implemented a High/Low airspace division which provided RNAV classification for the high levels whilst retaining the ATS route designator for the lower levels.
5. The SWG was very productive due to the cooperation of all participants in discussions on this subject. The information provided showed that the States are aware of the benefits of RNAV nomenclature and are actively working to upgrade their procedures to provide a more efficient service to airline operators.
6. IATA commented on the positive approach of all representatives at both the SWG and the Task Force itself. They were gratified with the significant amount of action occurring within each State, including the initiative in the redesignation of traditional routes into RNAV routes and the implementation of new RNAV routes.
7. IATA further advised the SWG/2 that the traffic data analysis provided a good starting point to allocate priorities based on those non RNAV routes with greater traffic needs. However the benefits were not just in the primary flows but could be realised on all routes. By States continuing to develop their own programs as well as considering proposals from others, the platform was in place to deliver long term efficiencies region wide. The challenge is to not exclude any proposal but rather consider how each proposal can be delivered.
8. The following Chart shows the present and intended progress by States on changing their ATS to RNAV routes in coordination with their neighbours.

Cambodia	G474, R468 B329, R583	RNAV procedures already in use Planned RNAV classification
China	A1, A202	Radar surveillance, 40 NM spacing in use
Hong Kong	A461, A583 A1, A202	RNAV classification being coordinated with Philippines RNAV classification being coordinated with China and Thailand
Indonesia	A461, R340, B472, B473	Working on change for RNAV classification
Laos	B218, R474, B349	Plans for reclassification
Malaysia	B348	Current coordination with Philippines – High/Low split
Philippines	A461, A583 B348 A590	Discussions with Hong Kong Coordination with Malaysia and Taiwan Coordination with Japan (already RNAV procedures in Japan)
Singapore	B348, G580 A464	Coordination with Malaysia To be renamed M774
Thailand	A464, G458	Domestic routes – plan in place
Vietnam	R471	Plan in place - Many RNAV routes implemented

.....