



RVSM/TF/2
WP/10
25/06/02

**INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION
ATM COMMITTEE OF THE GREPECAS ATM/CNS/SUBGROUP**

SECOND MEETING OF THE RVSM TASK FORCE
(Sao Jose dos Campos, Sao Paulo, 8 to 12 July 2002)

(Presented by IATA)

Agenda Item 5: Analyze and recommend the best implementation steps in the CAR/SAM Regions, taking into account the fleet preparation and ATC simulations.

Summary

This working paper presents the IATA position on the implementation format of RVSM for the CAR/SAM Region and at the same time conveying some important issues to be taken into account at the moment of selecting an RVSM implementation format.

1 Background

1.1 The GREPECAS/10 meeting held in Las Palmas, Spain last October determined under conclusion 10/11 the implementation of RVSM in the CAR/SAM Region on 01 April 2004. The conclusion established that the implementation would take place in two phases; the first phase will cover from FL350 to FL390. The second phase, at a date to be determined in accordance with the operational needs, will cover the rest of the flight levels. The reason for this GREPECAS decision was so that it would coincide with the USA domestic airspace RVSM implementation.

1.2 Since GREPECAS/10 the USA has decided to implement RVSM in a single phase, which will cover FL290 to FL390.

2 Discussion

2.1 At the Third Meeting/workshop of the Air Traffic Management Authorities and Planners held in Lima on the 20 of May 2002, the ICAO secretariat and the IATA Regional Office presented separate papers recommending States to implement RVSM in the CAR/SAM Region in a single phase coinciding with USA's domestic airspace.

2.2 Now, GREPECAS/11 must decide whether the CAR/SAM region will implement in two phases as approved originally or follow the spirit of harmonization in GREPECAS/10 implementing in a single phase coinciding with USA domestic airspace.

2.3 Research performed by the IATA Regional Office aimed at RVSM implementation yielded that by the last quarter of 2004 the IATA and no-IATA, domestic and international, passenger and cargo flights, lasting longer than one hour (or 250NM), will be 87,76% RVSM or RVSM capable.

2.4 The same research showed that the states of Argentina, Bolivia, Peru and Venezuela, have under their registration a large quantity of old aircraft, which are not considered to be economically feasible for upgrading. Therefore these States should coordinate with their airlines to find a solution to this problem.

2.5 In addition to the above, IATA has other important observations that could be significant for the States at the time of deciding how to implement RVSM:

- a) During the last ATM Authorities' meeting, Mexico and Cuba opted for implementing in a single phase regardless of the GREPECAS/11 decision.
- b) Implementing in two phases implies a more elaborated and expensive Safety Assessment.
- c) Implementing in two phases allows those airlines based in the CAR/SAM Region (25 % or less of the total aircraft population) to have more time to prepare for RVSM.
- d) Implementing in two phases will penalize those aircraft already RVSM approved and based in the CAR/SAM Region (75% percent or more).
- e) Implementing in a single phase will penalize only 12% of the total flights in the CAR/SAM Region.
- f) Implementing in two phases forces the USA to create a transition zone.
- g) Implementing in two phases increase the safety risk when controllers transfer aircraft in descent or climb, from an RVSM stratum to a non-RVSM stratum, and finally to an RVSM stratum again.
- h) Implementing in two phases can create confusion for crews flying from or into the CAR/SAM Region, using different IFR cruising levels depending of the altitude for the aircraft.
- i) The only experience of implementation in two phases was in the North Atlantic, where the traffic patterns are one directional flow.
- j) If implementation occurs in two phases, it will be necessary to decide the length of time it will take to replace non-RVSM aircraft for RVSM aircraft.

2.6 RVSM implementation is a Regional effort and thus all countries must agree to a common regional implementation format. Those States that do not intent to implement RVSM in a give stratum of its airspace should then assume the responsibility of a transition area within the airspace under its jurisdiction, in such a manner the regional concept does not fail and freedom of decision is maintained by the State.

2.7 IATA is willing to cooperate with the States in bring together the airlines, especially those with precarious fleets, in order to look for possible solutions.

3 Suggested Action

3.1 The meeting is invited to take note of the provided in this working paper.