



International Civil Aviation Organization

The Sixth Meeting of the Aeronautical Information Services – Aeronautical Information Management Implementation Task Force (AAITF/6)

Bangkok, Thailand, 15 to 17 March 2011

-
- Agenda Item 4: Review of APANPIRG/21**
Agenda Item 6: Review of Air Navigation Deficiencies in the AIS Field and Proposed Action

**REVIEW OF THE REPORT OF APANPIRG 21, AND
FOLLOW-UP ON CONCLUSIONS AND DECISIONS RELEVANT TO THE AIS FIELD**

(Presented by the Chairman)

SUMMARY

This paper highlights the discussion at the 21st Meeting of the APANPIRG with regard to AIS issues.

Action by AITF/6 is at paragraph 3.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The 21st Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (APANPIRG/21, September 2010) was held in Bangkok, Thailand.

2. ITEMS DISCUSSED

2.1 **Attachment** to this paper is the significant items relevant to discussions related to ATM/AIS/SAR domain (Item 1), global and inter-regional activities (Item 2), the Regional Performance Framework (Item 3) and the Deficiency List (Item 4).

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the deliberations of APANPIRG/21;
- b) identify items from the APANPIRG/21 report that AAITF needs to undertake and list them in the Task List;
- c) review and update the Item 4 list of the Air Navigation Deficiencies in the AIS fields, for further review by APANPIRG/22 to be held from 5 to 9 September 2011; and
- d) identify actions to be taken by AAITF or States concerned to correct the identified deficiencies.

.....

APANPIRG Item 1 – ATM/AIS/SAR

Air Traffic Management

*Report on the Second Meeting of ICAO Flight Plan and ATS Messages
Implementation Task Force*

1.1 The 20th Meeting of the ATM/AIS/SAR Sub-Group (ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/20, June 2010) reviewed the outcomes of the Second Meeting of ICAO Flight Plan and ATS Messages Implementation Task Force (FPL&AM/TF/2, November 2009). Although not directly related to AIS, some summary information has been provided for the benefit of the AAITF representatives not also directly involved in the ICAO FPL&AM/TF. The information is provided at Appendix to this attachment.

Aeronautical Information Services

Fifth Meeting of the AIS-AIM Implementation Task Force

1.2 ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/20 noted that the Fifth Meeting of ICAO AIS-AIM Implementation Task Force (AAITF/5) was held on 25 and 26 June 2010. Australia advised AAITF/5 that information on the progress made by AIS-AIM Study Group was valuable and the activities of the group should be followed by AAITF to suitably reflect the progress in the work programme of the Task Force. In this regard, ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/20 adopted Decision SG 20/7 – Monitor the Progress at the AIS-AIM Study Group.

1.3 ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/20 noted that States proposed a Draft Decision where AIS and MET could be matched together under ATM/AIS/SAR/SG of APANPIRG. During the discussion on this issue, IATA recalled that APANPIRG had in the past conducted the CNS/MET and the ATM/AIS/SAR Sub-Group meetings concurrently on two occasions at the same venue to foster better coordination. However, due to high workload in the respective fields, the desired result had not been achieved. The meeting was of view that AIS being closely associated with the ATM function, it should not be detached from ATM/AIS/SAR Sub-Group. In the absence of strong justification in supporting of the draft conclusion formulated by the Task Force, the meeting did not support the Draft Decision proposed by the Task Force.

APANPIRG Item 2 – Global and Inter-regional Activities

Transition towards Aeronautical Information Management

2.1 The meeting recognized the need for an ICAO strategy to migrate to AIM in a manner that will ensure the availability of aeronautical information to any ATM user in a globally interoperable and fully digital environment. The meeting was apprized the progress made by ICAO in the transition towards AIM by addressing the recommendations resulting from the 2006 Global Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) Congress and through amendments to Annexes 4 – *Aeronautical Charts* and 15 – *Aeronautical Information Services* that are designed to progress the global framework required for the implementation of AIM.

2.2 The meeting noted that ICAO Council adopted the amendments to Annexes 4 and 15 that conform with the *Roadmap for the Transition from AIS to AIM*, and contribute to a basis for AIM through further provisions for quality management; enabling clauses for the use of digital data exchange; revised provisions related to the automated pre-flight briefing; an improved NOTAM format; amendment to strengthen aeronautical information regulation and control (AIRAC) adherence; and new provisions for the e-AIP. The meeting, noting the global developments in the field of AIM, confirmed the need to take these developments into account in defining the regional work programme.

ASIA/PACIFIC REGION

PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK FORM

(REGIONAL)

(amended 10 September 2010)

REGIONAL PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE: <u>APAC Objective 6</u>				
ENHANCED PROVISION OF AIS/AIM				
Benefits				
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhanced collaboration between flight crew and the ATM system, • improved collaborative decision making, • improved predictability, and • reduction of workload for aircrew and ATC. 			
Strategy				
Short to Medium term (2009 – 2012)				
ATM OC COMPONENTS	TASKS	TIME FRAME	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
SDM <i>(ATM Service Delivery Management)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the enhanced provisions for AIM becoming available through the work of the Aeronautical Information Services-Aeronautical Information Management Study Group (AIS-AIMSG); • Monitor implementation progress 	2009-2016	AAITF	In progress TF will develop detailed monitoring framework to track States implementation of AIM (AAITF Task List – Action Item 6 refers)
	Consolidation: (Refer AIM Roadmap) 1. Monitoring of Annex differences 2. AIRAC adherence monitoring 3. Quality 4. WGS-84 implementation	2009 - 2013	AAITF	As above

	<p>Going Digital: (Refer AIM Roadmap)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data integrity monitoring 2. Data quality monitoring 3. Aerodrome mapping 4. Electronic AIP 5. Obstacles 6. Terrain 7. Integrated aeronautical information database 8. Unique identifiers 9. Aeronautical information conceptual model 	2009 - 2014	AAITF	As above
	<p>Information Management: (Refer AIM Roadmap)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aeronautical data exchange 2. Digital NOTAM 3. Communication networks 4. Aeronautical information briefing 5. Training Interoperability with meteorological products 7. Electronic aeronautical charts 8. Agreements with data originators 	2013 - 2016	AAITF	As above
GPIs	GPI/18: Aeronautical Information			
References	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Annex 4 – Aeronautical Charts</i> • <i>Annex 15 – Aeronautical Information Services</i> • <i>AIS Manual (Doc 8126)</i> • <i>Aeronautical Chart Manual (Doc 8697)</i> • <i>EUROCONTROL Operating Procedures for AIS Dynamic Data (OPADD)</i> • <i>APANPIRG Conclusion 20/16</i> 			

APANPIRG Item 4 – Deficiency List

Identification		Deficiencies			Corrective Actions			
Requirements	States/facilities	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Description	Executing body	Target for completion	Priority for action
<u>WGS-84</u>								
Requirements of section 3.7.1 of Annex 15	Bhutan	WGS-84 - Not implemented	2/7/1999	Data conversion completed, but not published		Bhutan	TBD	A
	China	WGS-84 - Partially implemented Implemented in the Sanya FIR since 1 November 2001	2/7/1999	Differences to Annex 15 - <i>Aeronautical Information Services</i> are notified		China	China advised APANPIRG/19 (September 2008, Bangkok) that WGS 84 implementation is in progress and planned to be completed in 2010 for all existing airports. All new airports will use WGS84 immediately. China confirmed to ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/20 that the implementation would be completed by the end of 2010.	A

Identification		Deficiencies			Corrective Actions			
Requirements	States/facilities	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Description	Executing body	Target for completion	Priority for action
	DPR Korea	WGS-84 - Not implemented				DPR Korea	DPRK advised ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/18 verbally that WGS 84 implementation was completed. The Regional Office is waiting for a formal report.	A
	Kiribati	WGS-84 - Not implemented				Kiribati	TBD	A
	Nauru	WGS-84 - Not implemented		Conferring with consultant		Nauru	TBD	A
	Solomon Islands	WGS-84 - Not implemented				Solomon Islands	1999	A
	Vanuatu	WGS-84 - Implemented at main airports	2/7/1999			Vanuatu	1999	A

Identification		Deficiencies			Corrective Actions			
Requirements	States/facilities	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Description	Executing body	Target for completion	Priority for action
<u>AIP Format</u>								
Requirements of Chapter 4 of Annex 15	Cook Islands	AIP Format - Not implemented	7/7/99			Cook Islands	ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/16 (June 2006) updated - AIP COOK ISLANDS in new format in progress with assistance of New Zealand, effective date by the end of 2008	A
	Kiribati	AIP Format - Not implemented	7/7/99			Kiribati	ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/18 (June 2008) updated - AIP in draft stage	A
	Nauru	AIP Format - Not implemented	7/7/99			Nauru	ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/18 (June 2008) updated - work soon to start	A
	Papua New Guinea	AIP Format - Not implemented	7/7/99			Papua New Guinea	TBA	A

APPENDIX 1 (excerpt from the APANPIRG/21 report)

APANPIRG Item 1 – ATM/AIS/SAR

Air Traffic Management

Report on the Second Meeting of ICAO Flight Plan and ATS Messages Implementation Task Force

3.2.9 ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/20 reviewed outcomes of the Second Meeting of ICAO Flight Plan and ATS Messages Implementation Task Force (FPL&AM/TF/2, November 2009). FPL&AM/TF/2 adopted an Asia/Pacific approach using a phased transition, where air navigation service providers (ANSPs) would implement NEW, followed by users. The transition period was sub-divided as follows:

- **Phase 1** – ANSPs software delivery and internal testing;
- **Phase 2** – ANSPs external testing and implementation; and
- **Phase 3** – Airspace users testing and implementation.

3.2.10 ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/20 noted the phased implementation. It was particularly noted that both the PRESENT and the NEW flight plan formats would be accepted during the Phase 3 from 1 July to 15 November 2012 by ANSPs, and users could file either format. ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/20 adopted Decision SG 20/3 – Phased Approach to Implement the NEW Flight Plan Format.

3.2.11 FPL&AM/TF/2 prepared the draft document titled *Asia/Pacific Guidance Material for the Implementation of Amendment 1 to Procedures for Air Navigation Service – Air Traffic Management*, (PANS-ATM, DOC 4444), 15th Edition.

3.2.12 The meeting reviewed the document and adopted a Conclusion as follows:

Conclusion 21/4 – Regional Guidance Material for the Implementation of Amendment 1 to PANS-ATM

That, in order for States to clearly understand what is intended in Amendment 1, the 'Asia/Pacific Guidance Material for the Implementation of Amendment 1 to the 15th Edition of the Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Air Traffic Management (PANS-ATM, Doc 4444)' provided in Appendix B to the APANPIRG/21 Report on Agenda Item 3.2 be adopted and published as regional guidance material.

3.2.13 The meeting noted that the *Interim Regional Strategy for Implementation of the New ICAO Flight Plan Format and Supporting ATS Messages* which had been adopted by APANPIRG/20 was reviewed by ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/20 on the basis of the updated and firm information, and the regional approaches agreed by the Task Force. After the review, the meeting agreed that the Interim Strategy could be a final authorized version and accordingly adopted Conclusion 21/5 – Strategy for Implementation of New Flight Plan Format.

3.2.14 The meeting noted that the Chairman of ATM/AIS/SAR/SG had expressed the view that implementation of the NEW flight plan format would be a problem if it is not implemented in a uniform manner globally. He had further stated that there would be huge problems if no fall back arrangement was to put in place. It was therefore considered important for States to review urgently the status and readiness for implementation. It was recognized that despite the action taken two years ago by establishing the Task Force, there were still a number of concerns on its implementation. Concern was raised that some States might not be able to meet the target date of implementation. IATA stated that it was not just FPL but also expected huge problems associated with the changes in

numerous ATS message formats. It was recognized that it was high time that States came up with strategies and timelines for implementation of the transition plan. In view of the above, the Task Force was expected to make a firm decision in a timely manner. It was emphasized that global harmonized implementation could only be achieved through timely coordination work carried out by ICAO Headquarters.

Flight Plan Implementation Tracking System (FITS)

3.2.15 It was noted that ICAO Flight Plan Implementation Tracking System (FITS) provides information regarding the implementation status of the NEW flight plan format in each State along with guidance and harmonized solutions to any difficulties encountered in the implementation process. It can be accessed at <http://www2.icao.int/en/FITS/Pages/home.aspx>. A State letter was issued by ICAO Headquarters requesting States to inform the respective ICAO regional office accredited to States of actions completed toward implementation of the PANS-ATM provisions regarding the NEW flight plan content which will ensure current status of FITS in each State. This issue was discussed and some updates were provided.

3.2.16 In view of this, the meeting formulated Conclusion 21/6 – Notification of State Transition Date to the NEW Flight Plan Format.

Review of the Third Meeting of the FPL&AM Implementation Task Force

3.2.74 The meeting reviewed the outcomes of FPL&AM/TF/3 (August 2010, Bangkok).

Items of Interest from other Regional Task Forces Implementing Amendment 1 to PANS-ATM, Doc 4444, 15th Edition

3.2.75 United States informed FPL&AM/TF/3 that a number of ICAO regions had established TF to develop transition plans. The coordination between them would substantially ease the transition for global users of aviation. A summary of conclusions and concerns from regional TF meetings was presented.

Differences between Asia/Pacific Guidance Material, and the FAA and EUROCONTROL Coding Guidance

3.2.76 Further, FPL&AM/TF/3 was informed that the United States noted a few specific differences between the draft Asia/Pacific guidance, and the FAA's guidance and EUROCONTROL's latest directive in the areas of PBN/ consistency checking and determining whether a flight plan is NEW or PRESENT.

3.2.77 In developing transition plans, EUROCONTROL in particular encountered difficulty in establishing filing practices within the Amendment 1 constraints that meet the requirements and permit filing of all required information in a way that is adequately detectable by automation. They therefore will use at least one non-standard indicator, "EUR/." This is at odds with the draft Asia/Pacific Guidance Material which states "Systems should not accept indicators in Item 18 which are not defined in the PANS-ATM." Australia wondered why the RMK/element wasn't used for this purpose.

Status of the FAA Transition Activities for the Implementation of Amendment 1 to Doc 4444, 15th Edition

3.2.78 United States recalled that FPL&AM/TF/2 agreed to a draft Regional Strategy for the Implementation, and provided an update and status on U.S. progress towards the schedule identified in the strategy.

3.2.79 FAA had adopted the Asia/Pacific transition strategy agreed to during FPL&AM/TF2.

Airspace User Testing

3.2.83 Prior to testing with live FAA systems, users will be provided the opportunity to submit Filed Flight Plans (FPL) and changes in NEW format to an off-line system for testing. This testing will be scheduled on a per-user basis and spread over the available time period.

3.2.84 FAA is investigating the possibility of developing a website that would enable users to check the format of test NEW FPLs against the Amendment 1 rules prior to any testing with actual systems. Upon successful completion of offline testing, approved users will be given the opportunity to file NEW format FPLs with operational systems during prescribed times at a limited number of sites. IATA reaffirmed their offer from previous meetings that their members were willing test partners and would support States where they can.

Hong Kong, China

3.2.86 As for other regions, there is no deadline published by ICAO for contracting States to notify their implementation date. It could therefore be at a very late stage when certain States declare non-compliance affecting a smooth global transition. Nevertheless, it is encouraging to learn that an “ICAO New Flight Plan Format Study Group” has been established in the Middle East region and the first meeting was held in Cairo, Egypt in February 2010.

3.2.87 In addition to the readiness of ANSPs, Hong Kong, China has concerns over a view that airlines would file PRESENT flight plans until the last day of the transition period. The subsequent switching over to NEW flight plan format on the same day by all airlines with insufficient testing may pose a high risk of serious and widespread coordination problem on that day. This problem might induce interruption of flight data availability to ATC, with airline operators eventually suffering from long ground delay.

3.2.88 Hong Kong, China would have no problem in meeting the target dates of the phased transition plan adopted by the FPL&AM Task Force with a tentative transition date on 30 June 2012.

New Zealand

3.2.89 New Zealand reported that Airways was aiming to have all software changes completed by the 17 November 2011 AIRAC allowing the New Zealand implementation to occur in the three phases.

Singapore

3.2.99 Singapore reported that identical FPLs were received from different sources - besides receiving FPL from the ATS Reporting Office, identical FPL was also received directly from the airline operator (AO). Additionally, States with automatic flight plan management systems are also sending out RPLs as FPLs based on the filed EOBT. These not only load the communication channels used between the ATS units but also raised the question of which is the acceptable or approved source for FPL.

3.2.100 IATA contributed to a discussion regarding multiple flight plan submission and pointed out that many operators had to either auto file or file manually depending on individual State requirements.

Thales Update

3.2.101 Based on the advice from Thales that software supporting Amendment 1 changes could be integrated into Thales systems and be disabled until the correct implementation date, FPL&AM/TF/3 accepted the recommendation from Australia that there be no restriction for an earlier software delivery than proscribed in the Phase 1 of the regional transition strategy.

Converted Flight Plan and AIDC

3.2.90 Japan informed the meeting that some States handled AIDC messages through AFTN as other ATS messages. On the other hand, some States such as Japan handled AIDC as a kind of ATC boundary information transfers through the dedicated leased lines, besides other ATS messages are handled through AFTN.

3.2.91 If a flight goes through three FIRs and only the second FIR has not yet commenced accepting NEW, it might be possible that the third FIR has a NEW flight plan format through AFTN and a PRESENT flight plan format (CPL) through AIDC at the same time. Concerning legitimacy, it may be a probable opinion that both of flight plans from AFTN and AIDC are equally legitimate even if some differences are existed. Another idea might be that the FPL messages which are obtained through AFTN should be always legitimate because AIDC messages could be converted. Or it might be possible that NEW FPL should be legitimate whenever a State has a NEW FPL and a PRESENT FPL for a single flight at the same time.

AIDC Messages Change Considerations

3.2.93 Australia, New Zealand and the United States informed FPL&AM/TF/3 that the ICD included the fields by reference to the PANS-ATM, so while there will be a minimal change to the ICD in this area, there were potentially significant impacts to the interfaces.

3.2.94 A PAC message, being preactivation before a flight is airborne, may require linking to a flight plan with a DOF element. Another possible exception is when an ABI is received before or when no DEP message has activated the Flight Plan.

3.2.95 It is important that the ANSPs involved in each interface coordinate a plan for testing the interface, and for operations in the Phase 3 when some filers can be potentially filing NEW and others PRESENT. It is possible to design systems to maintain operational messages in PRESENT format regardless of what format was filed, or to transmit AIDC messages using the format in which the flight plan was received. Presence of both NEW and PRESENT flight data on each interface also implies that the receiving system will be able to recognize which format a flight plan is in.

ICAO New Flight Plan Format Issue

Australia

3.2.105 State letter AN 13/2.1-09/9 dated 6 February 2009 - Guidance for implementation of flight plan information to support Amendment 1 of the *Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Air Traffic Management*, Fifteenth Edition (PANS-ATM, DOC 4444) advised States that the flight plan changes had considerable consequences on ANSP flight data processing systems that check and accept flight plans and related messages, use flight plan data in displays for controller reference, use data in ANSP automation and which support communication between ANSPs as the flight progresses. Preparation for the changes should therefore be made well in advance of the applicable date. The changes also have consequences for airspace users. If a flight plan with new content is sent to an ANSP that has not prepared to accept the new content then it is likely that some information will be lost, misinterpreted or cause a rejection of the flight plan.

3.2.106 Additionally, State Letter AN 13/2.1-09/9 states that “to allow performance case considerations to drive individual airspace user and ANSP implementation schedules, the ATM system will need to simultaneously support both PRESENT and NEW for a period of time.” However, from 15 November 2012, ANSPs are not required to accept and process PRESENT and airspace users are expected to file NEW as using PRESENT is not assured.

3.2.107 At FPL&AM/TF/2 a number of risks associated with implementation were identified during development of the region’s implementation strategy. These risks are summarised as follows:

- a) IATA advised that in order to ensure compliance by States the changes to the flight plan format should be issued as SARPs to ensure uniform application by all States as it is necessary in the interests of safety or regularity of international air navigation. Amendment 1 to PANS-ATM 4.4.1.3 still only advises operators and ATS units that they *should* comply with the instructions for completion of the flight plan form.
- b) On FITS located at <http://www2.icao.int/en/FITS/Pages/home.aspx>, it is apparent that there is a great majority of States that are still only evaluating their current systems with no update regarding implementation.
- c) State Letter AN 13/2.1-09/9 provides a conversion table for flight plan data from NEW to PRESENT however no conversion from PRESENT to NEW is available. Therefore if an aircraft transits FIRs which alternately support NEW, PRESENT and NEW data will be irretrievably lost.
- d) If there is no universal adoption by States of the NEW flight plan format there is a possibility that airspace users will not be prepared to adopt the changes as there would be a requirement to update their flight planning systems to allow filing of flight plans in two formats in circumstances where a region or ANSP only supports NEW or PRESENT.

3.2.108 There would be a significant financial investment to be made by States and airspace users to implement the 2012 ICAO Flight Plan. States require a level of certainty to be provided through ICAO’s PANS and SARPs that the changes to be implemented are going to be adopted by all States and airspace users.

Japan

3.2.66 Japan advised that problem would happen if some States or some airspace users do not comply with NEW flight plan format. The transition should be done in a coordinated manner targeting the applicability date. ICAO has established the guidance material for smooth transition, and urged the contracting States to transit to the NEW.

3.2.68 The meeting was strongly urged that all States should commit to apply the NEW flight plan format by 15 November 2012.

3.2.69 States not notifying their schedule date and implementation methodology should notify to ICAO Bangkok office as early as possible.

3.2.70 Further, Japan was of view that each State needed to know the transition plan of adjacent States in order to start the coordination earlier.

3.2.71 If the case more than three FIRs are close, trilateral coordination would be needed.

3.2.72 The meeting agreed that Contracting States should start close coordination as early as possible with adjacent States based on the transition plan that was notified by each State.

3.2.73 The meeting thanked Japan for the working papers. The meeting agreed that it is important that coordination between States/FIRs should start as soon as possible to ensure a smooth transition. The meeting adopted Conclusion 21/13 - Coordination for the Transition to the NEW Flight Plan Format among States.

Regional Guidance Material for the Implementation of the NEW flight Plan Format

3.2.102 The meeting was informed that FPL&AM/TF/2 discussed the complexity of the matters at hand, noting that a standardised interpretation of Amendment 1 to PANS-ATM was absolutely critical to a successful implementation. It was evident that a number of different interpretations were already being made by States. A number of other issues had developed that would require interpretation/decision by the Task Force, and it was likely that this would continue to be the case as more States commenced implementation activities and sought to more clearly understand what was intended by Amendment 1. FPL&AM/TF/2 agreed that codification of all this information into a suitable regional guidance material would be very beneficial in facilitating a common understanding of issues across the region.

3.2.103 In order to record the approaches, interpretations and resolutions agreed by the Task Force for use as Asia/Pacific guidance material, FPL&AM/TF/2 commenced work on a repository of coding guidelines and associated material for application in affected automation systems. A draft document titled *Asia/Pacific Guidance Material for the Implementation of Amendment 1 to Procedures for Air Navigation Service – Air Traffic Management, (PANS-ATM, DOC 4444), 15th Edition*, was prepared as in Appendix B to the Report on Agenda Item 3.2.

United States

3.2.109 United States informed the meeting that the following instruction for Item 18 is included in the Amendment: *Note: Use of indicators not included under this item may result in data being rejected, processed incorrectly or lost.*

3.2.110 European Region signaled intent to document a difference in Regional Supplemental Procedures (Doc. 7030). They plan to require filing of an indicator that is not defined in the PANS-ATM to contain region-specific information.

3.2.111 It was recognized that it could be useful to segregate region-specific data in order to avoid confusion or training difficulties for other regions. For example, the fact that a flight is exempt from European requirements for VHF RTF with 8.33 kHz spacing is of no relevance to other regions.

3.2.112 United States, however, advised the meeting that the presence of “EUR/” may subject flight plans to rejection in other regions, depending on the automation system in particular States.

3.2.113 United States further advised that documenting a non-standard filing practice in SUPPS would therefore seem to be insufficient if the non-standard practice affects automated flight plan processing in other regions. Such actions need coordination among all affected regions.

3.2.114 There were several potential solutions to this problem, including but not limited to:

- 1) **Avoid use of non-standard indicators.** Regional filing requirements should make use of only the defined indicators.
- 2) **Allow unrecognized indicators.** Automation systems would accept and pass along any such information received, but would otherwise ignore it. Regions would document any non-standard indicators in their Regional Supplemental Procedures (Doc 7030) which would allow other regions to program for them if desired.
- 3) **Define an indicator for each region.** The content for each indicator would be managed within the region (e.g. EUR/, NAM/, SAM/).

3.2.115 In any case, if region-specific indicators are allowed, there should be no expectation that ANSPs in other regions would be able to understand, maintain or otherwise communicate with filers or pilots about the contents of them.

3.2.116 For more information, contact should be made to Mr. Ray Ahlberg, Safety and Operations Support and the FAA representative to FPL&AM/TF, at ray.ahlberg@faa.gov.

IATA

3.2.117 IATA recalled that ICAO issued the State letter AN 13/2.1-08/50 on 25 June 2008 amending the 15th edition of PANS-ATM. The effective date of 15 November 2012 gave industry stakeholders more than four years to make necessary preparations for changes to the NEW ICAO FPL and associated ATS messages.

3.2.118 IATA maintained that due to the importance of the changes, the formats should be adopted as a Standard and not simply a Recommendation. The reliance on messaging with every automated system is such that a single “point of failure” (or non compliance) could have a wide ranging impact.

3.2.119 APANPIRG/19 recognized the implication of these changes when establishing the FPL&AM/TF while also noting that they considered that ICAO global leadership was critical in addressing the issues to ensure a smooth transition.

Regional/State Readiness

3.2.121 In this region, most States missed the APANPIRG deadline to notify the ICAO Regional Office its transition plans and target dates by 1 July 2010 in accordance with Conclusion 20/8. The Asia/Pacific task force itself, however, has been instrumental in developing some excellent guidance material and has attempted to highlight its concerns globally.

Cutover Plan

3.2.122 IATA informed the meeting that the actual timeline for airlines to cutover to the NEW format had not been defined with no guidelines for handling of traffic already airborne. Without clearly defined plans and timelines, the ability for airlines to prepare was limited. The only date available was 15 November 2012 which would potentially lead to every airline in the world switching to the new Format on the same day, potentially at the same time.

Regional Variations

3.2.123 While the NEW format may not be the best for every circumstance, it represents a significant step forward, particularly with respect to PBN notifications. If a revision to the guidelines is considered necessary, it should either be adopted on a global basis or else rejected. Regional or State solutions should be strongly discouraged.

3.2.124 Variations in any part of the format would likely create problems for both airlines and ANSPs. AIDC messaging in particular creates an enormous problem with States reliant on the ability of other States “upstream” to process messaging appropriately.

Review by the Meeting

3.2.128 States felt that a contingency plan should be formulated which should cover eventualities where a State or group of States is not in a position to receive flight plans in the NEW Format. ICAO advised that FPL&AM/TF agreed that it was premature to develop the contingency plan as no State in the Region has explicitly expressed that the effective date of 15 November 2012 would not be met. The task Force would continue to urge States to implement the NEW flight plan format by the due date. Nevertheless, FPL&AM/TF was aware of the possibility for the need to develop the contingency plan and had included the task in the task list of the Task Force to be commenced in the first quarter of 2012.

3.2.129 In regard to making the NEW flight plan format an ICAO Standard, ICAO advised that the proposal had been discussed at the ANC. The ANC was of view that the NEW flight plan format should remain in the PAN status.

3.2.130 The meeting thanked Australia, the United States and IATA for their working paper. The meeting agreed that the regional and the global coordination be further enhance and issue to be raised with the ICAO headquarters and possibly with the DGCA/47 in October 2010, and adopted the following Conclusion:

Conclusion 21/14- - Enhancement of the Global Coordination for Implementation of the NEW Flight Plan Format

That, in light of the varying degree of States in implementing the NEW flight plan format, ICAO:

- i) urge all the States, including those outside the Asia/Pacific Region, to record their readiness in the FITS;*
- ii) take action to ensure that any States or ICAO regions not use non-standard local procedures; and*
- iii) ensure appropriate coordination take place between ICAO regional planning and implementation groups (PIRGs) to address implementation issues.*

3.2.132 The Regional Office informed the meeting that the next FPL&AM/TF/4 will be held from 21 to 25 March [revised to new dates: 30 May – 3 June] 2011 and invited all the States to join the meeting.