



**International Civil Aviation Organization
UNDP/ICAO Regional Project RLA/98/003
Transition to CNS/ATM Systems in the CAR and SAM Regions**

**Tenth Meeting/Workshop of ATM Authorities and Planners in the CAR/SAM Regions
(AP/ATM/10)**

(Lima, Peru, from 10 to 14 May 2005)

Agenda Item 3: Review of the RVSM issues in the CAR/SAM Regions

Result of RVSM implementation in Rochambeau UIR

(Presented by French Guiana (France))

Summary

This Information Paper presents information about the result of RVSM Implementation in Rochambeau UIR.

1. Condition of implementation

1.1 Unfortunately, Cayenne ACC was hit by national industrial action the precise day of RVSM implementation (January 20). However, ATC services were exceptionally provided, to ensure transition period from CVSM to RVSM.

2. ATC

2.1 Air Traffic Controllers adapted themselves to the new spacing standard without any problem. No regulations or delay were assigned to this event.

3. Air Operators

3.1 Air Operators got fully ready for RVSM. Before RVSM implementation, less than 2% of flights used FL 270 and FL 280. Since RVSM implementation, 8 % of aircraft movements have to be maintained out of RVSM airspace (mainly below FL 290), because of non RVSM approval. Today, part of aircraft refused in RVSM airspace seems to be decreasing.

4. Airspace

4.1 Concerning RVSM airspace, i.e. from FL 290 to FL 410 included, it is noted a new flight level distribution:

- a) Increase of traffic below FL 290, due to non RVSM approved aircraft still operating
- b) Decrease of traffic at FL 290 and 310, less favourable for the consumption
- c) Dispatch of the majority of aircraft between FL 340 and 380, economically more interesting regarding fuel consumption. As a matter of fact, before RVSM, 84 % of flights were distributed between three flight levels: FL330, FL350 and FL370. Since then, distribution decreased to 43 % between FL330, FL350 and FL370, and reached 54 % between FL 340, FL 360 and FL 380.

4.2 **Appendix A** of this Working Paper shows graphically this distribution.

5. Improvement

5.1 Improvement of the system goes in two directions:

- i) Looking for “cheater” operators, stating through the FPL to be RVSM, even when they are not. When disclose, a report is send to the operator, emphasizing the direct impact on the safety by using a non RVSM aircraft in an RVSM exclusionary airspace.
- ii) A new computer system, handling more characters in box 10, 15 and 18 of FPL, allowing better information to ATC.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Implementation of RVSM can be qualified as a success. After 4 months of working, the creation of six additional flight levels increases significantly the capacity of the airspace, allowing more economic flights to operators and giving more flexibility to air traffic controllers in air traffic management.

7. Suggested action

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

RVSM

TRAFFIC DISTRIBUTION SINCE RVSM IMPLEMENTATION

